PEDAGOGY AND THE BODY IN SHERWOOD ANDERSON'S *WINESBURG, OHIO*

By

BELINDA DIANE BRUNER

Bachelor of Arts
in Arts and Sciences
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1987

Master of Arts
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1991

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 1998

PEDAGOGY AND THE BODY IN

SHERWOOD ANDERSON'S

WINESBURG, OHIO

Dissertation Approved:

Dissertation Advisor

Edward Jones

Margaret S Ewing

Wayne B. Powell

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

This study began with my desire to critically examine the pedagogical relationships that have shaped my life as a student and as a teacher. I am awestruck by Sherwood Anderson's depiction of teachers in *Winesburg, Ohio* and their relationships with their students. With my work I intend to provide a close reading of these relationships. No book or article has been devoted to a study of the teachers in *Winesburg, Ohio* as such. Scholars have tended to persist with general readings of the work as a regionalist text or as a *bildungsroman.* While these readings are certainly valid and may, at times, provide a backdrop for my own study, the emergence of critical pedagogy as a frame for analysis allows readers the chance to reconsider Anderson's work with more thoughtful attention to his vivid depictions of students and teachers. He is candid, expressive, and daring in his portrayal of the intimate, even erotic element of pedagogical relationships. Yet his portrayals are so gentle and sensitive that the reality of the situation has often gone unacknowledged.[1]

This dissertation is dedicated to the teachers in my life. Anything I accomplish is in some way a result of their influence. I also wish to thank the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Edward Jones, Dr. Margaret Ewing, Dr. Melinda Gough, and especially my advisor, Dr. Linda Leavell, who has encouraged me and my work for many years. I also owe thanks to my friends for their unwavering support, particularly Lisa Rohrbach and Anthony Kable; my students for the challenges and insights they have brought me; and the many unofficial teachers I have known throughout my life including my grandmother, Irene Bruner, and my son Jordan Bigelow. Without these people I would not be the person I am today. Finally, I would like to thank my mother for allowing me to dig in the dirt with my cat, and my father for encouraging me to dance naked in the rain.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

THE TOUCH OF THE GROTESQUE: ANDERSON'S MIRACLE

At the time *Winesburg, Ohio* was written the stories emphatically reflected two growing themes in American literature, most clearly regionalism and more covertly feminism and sexuality. The latter of these can arguably be part of the broader modern influence of psychoanalysis.[2] This study will reflect on these elements in retrospect in order to place the book in its canonical context. But the main purpose is to devote new attention to Anderson's *Winesburg, Ohio* within a more contemporary framework--that of the emerging branch of critical theory usually termed "critical pedagogy." Critical pedagogy began to develop in a contemporary context with the publication of Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* At first considered primarily a political text, Freire's work has been a catalyst for the collective study of teaching which includes child development theory, sexuality and gender issues, multi-cultural perspectives in the American education system, and parallels between teaching and settings for psychoanalysis. The latter has primarily focused on

professional and personal distinctions in the pedagogical relationship and the use of erotic energy in the classroom.

In Anderson's presentation of his grotesquely desperate villagers, he handles this risky yet essential exploration, though it is normally regarded as only a minor aspect of his characters' psychological dramas. In Anderson's overtly symbolic first story of *Winesburg, Ohio*, the carpenter builds and the old man writes, but nameless people take these essentials for themselves and wind up living as fabrications, afraid to don their own truths. Watching this carnival community, one often overlooks the small, simple scraps of love. This is the challenge Anderson presents to his readers: to be distracted by the magnificent masks or to focus on the unadorned fragments of reality. In a literary sense Anderson moves quietly between Realism and Modernism.

Sherwood Anderson is often viewed as a psychological writer, the classic analysis of Anderson's relationship to psychology being Frederick J. Hoffman's chapter on Anderson in *Freudianism and the Literary Mind*. In this study, Hoffman surveys critics' attempts to place Anderson's work and Anderson the man within the psychoanalytic context which seemed to fuel the development of Modernism. Hoffman investigates the major controversy of whether Anderson wrote with conscious knowledge of Freud; he groups the divided opinions and retraces their steps toward

evidence. In the end he concludes that though there are certainly parallels between Anderson's work and Freudianism it seems unlikely that Freudian psychoanalysis prompted or influenced the work. Rather, Hoffman believes that as Anderson learned about psychoanalysis he saw such concepts as useful to the public in understanding his art.

Scholars interested in the psychological aspects of Anderson's work point to sublimation and repression of sexuality as major themes.[3] Much attention has been drawn to his portrayals of the sexual psyches of his characters. Typically, such studies come to the same conclusion--that the townspeople of Winesburg, both male and female, are sexually stifled or stunted. I will draw upon these works to examine the lives of the teachers and students in Winesburg. Many see the inarticulateness of the townspeople, including the most intellectual characters, as a symptom of their sexual frustration. Similar claims have been made about Anderson himself. Several scholars have investigated Anderson's possible bisexuality, his notions of creativity as a female process, his conventional Oedipal relationship with his parents, and his confusion about the masculine gender role.[4]

Anderson has also been characterized as being stereotypically sexist in his attitudes toward women, tending to see them as angels or whores. Anderson unapologetically used women as muses

and wives to support him throughout his career, though he did appear to be genuinely grateful to them as such: "I've never been able to work without a woman to love. Perhaps I'm cruel. . . I live by the woman loved. I take from her. I know damn well I don't give enough" (Sutton 233). He also openly idealized his mother, seemingly with the knowledge that such regard was a common pretense: "Idealize her. Why not? . . . The dream is as true as the reality" (502). This seems to be an extension of his general idea that descriptions of the truth inside are always false. Anderson knew many women from all states of life and in all roles--sister, mother, wives, prostitutes, lesbians. Women liked him because he was a good listener. And yet he knew that he could never truthfully express all the things he heard. He projected his fantasies and failures onto female characters, perhaps more harshly than he did his male characters.[5] Sally Adair Rigsby argues that it is the grotesque male's inability "to accept affection and passion as natural and valuable aspects of life" that makes him resort to the idealization or degradation of women and that *Winesburg, Ohio* is "a microcosm of the modern world in which the potential of the feminine has not yet been realized" (236, 243).[6]

The feminine is not allowed to grow in the male or in the female character of Winesburg. Studies of female characters in Anderson's work showcase characters such as Kate Swift and

Elizabeth Willard as sexually stagnant and mentally fragile as a result.[7] This position, however, is rather one-sided. All of the citizens of Winesburg display some degree of emotional fragility; sexual repression or oppression is a plight common to both male and female characters in Winesburg and is only one of the many regrets and disappointments implicated in the explanation of the community's despair. Anderson is not deliberately making "spinsterhood" or "latent homosexuality" the cause of all mental imbalance. Instead, he portrays the human being as having at his or her center a nagging vacancy, a painful isolation that often revolves around sexual need and identity. Bidney regards this pain as gender confusion and a desire for androgyny. This void is what the members of the community expect George Willard to fulfill or express for them. Anderson himself is so thoughtful and earnest in his desire to portray his characters' feelings adequately that he even makes critical comments on his own telling of the stories. As Anderson gropes for a way to explain Wing Biddlebaum's effeminacy, for example, he acknowledges that to explain Wing's nature he "needs the poet." And though high expectations are placed on his central character, Anderson's George Willard is often left puzzled by his encounters with the insatiable, unnameable longings of the townspeople.

The centrality of George Willard is the basis for studying *Winesburg, Ohio* as a *bildungsroman.* George appears in fifteen of the stories in *Winesburg, Ohio* and often he serves as a link between various episodes. Critics note the almost constant presence of sexual pain and anxiety in Anderson's coming of age stories.[8] Certainly, sexual events and epiphanies are crucial to an individual's maturation process and Anderson depicts these events without reticence. But critics respond as if George Willard were the only character in *Winesburg, Ohio* with enough power and spirit to process such emotions and experiences. At times it is argued that even George fails at gaining any lucid perspective and that the book ends with his abandonment of the entire endeavor--no understanding for himself and no salvation for any of the people he leaves behind. This observation is too easily accepted as the final meaning of the story and ignores the fact that many of the sexual and developmental utterances and ineptitudes in Winesburg do not revolve around George Willard. A great portion of powerful and epiphanic episodes focus instead on the lives of the teachers in the stories.

Though rarely depicted in a *bildungsroman* or *kunstlerroman,* a teacher obviously would be a vital presence in one's development. Next to parents, teachers are the most influential people in a person's life, especially if that person grows up to become an

artist or an academic. The mentoring in such a case is indispensable and unforgettable; rarely is there an artist or academic without a cherished teacher forever living and breathing in the heart and head of the now grown and independent student. The intensity of this relationship has been given some attention through the distancing effect of theory, but more passionate renderings are avoided, perhaps because of the risk of revealing an erotic element in the presentation of student-teacher narratives. In the realm of psychology, where family dynamics and therapeutic dynamics are legitimized by much scientific groundwork, love and desire are not necessarily outrageous or threatening subtexts. But in the field of teaching and learning, sexual desire is still a paralyzing taboo. It is perhaps for this reason that so few depictions of student-teacher relationships are realistically reported in either practical or fictional accounts of teaching. There are exceptional cases. The work of James Joyce and D.H. Lawrence, in which schooling and intellectual development are central, immediately springs to mind.[9] As with Anderson, both of these writers were remarked upon for their psychological and sexual explorations in human relationships which sometimes included relationships between students and teachers. But no modern American writer faces the sexual nature of teaching and learning with more brutality and tenderness than does Sherwood

Anderson. Unfortunately, few critics have been comfortable enough with this theme to explore it. Judy Jo Small points out, in reference to "Hands," that most critics are unwilling to address what they must see as a disturbing issue: "if there is a sexual component in a teacher's feelings for a student (or vice versa . . .), should that not be repressed? Like George Willard, most readers have not wanted to confront that question" (37).

In my study of *Winesburg, Ohio* I will address such questions by intersecting the theoretical framework of sex and pedagogy with the passions discovered and expressed in Anderson's fiction and with the sensual nature of real learning and teaching experiences. In the following chapter I will provide an overview of the exchange of ideas that has taken place concerning sexuality and pedagogy. This should be of interest to both theorists and educators; ideally, it will give educators a theoretical context and will give theorists a more practical sense of their field. In the subsequent chapters I will examine Anderson's *Winesburg, Ohio* through the state of the art lens of critical pedagogy. I will explore the pedagogical implications of the sexual portraits of key characters. As I engage critical pedagogy with close readings of Wing Biddlebaum, Kate Swift, and George Willard, I will focus on the physical expressions of their bodies and on Anderson's attempt to express their feelings toward each other. Anderson demonstrates the impact a teacher

can have on a student's life, the ways in which students sometimes serve as teachers, and the potential use and abuse of erotic energy in the classroom. I will analyze the energy underlying those situations. While the drive in these interactions can range from sensual to dispassionate to homoerotic, voyeuristic, or autoerotic, the common denominator is each character's body. Thus, chapter three probes the repressed sexuality of Wing's body, chapter four is an examination of learning and looking at Kate's body, and chapter five details the student body as it is depicted by Anderson, and the methods by which the student body best learns or tragically fails to learn.

My overall objective is to emphasize the sensual nature of learning in its many manifestations and to show how Anderson incorporates this in *Winesburg, Ohio* , a story of a community in desperate need of connectedness and insight, whose citizens often use physical gesture to explain feelings for which they have no words. What one observes in the behavior of Winesburg's writer and his teachers may help Anderson scholars further their understanding of this crushing manifesto of isolation amidst a mob. In the final chapter I will note ways in which the texts exchanged between a student and a teacher serve as surrogate bodies that each individual may handle safely and by which he or she may communicate passion and gratitude or love. Throughout the

dissertation I will include real narratives of student and teacher relationships and stories of real bodies in real classrooms. My hope is that these stories reinforce the necessity of my study for practical enlightenment concerning the most important vocation of teaching. In doing so I will submit my most essential beliefs and pleasures to criticism, taking my cue from Anderson who explains in *Many Marriages* that the body is a deep well with a heavy iron door, but that sometimes life comes along and lifts up the lid. When that has happened, "dark hidden things, festering in the well, came out and found expression for themselves, and the miracle was that, expressed, they became often very beautiful" (217). Somewhere between the fear suggested by Small and the beauty envisioned by Anderson, my work resides.

Show and Tell

Like many writing classes, my classes are small, intimate settings. So at the risk of being misidentified as a kindergarten teacher I start each semester by getting to know my students. They get in small groups and introduce themselves, and I usually give them one task, such as to find out something unique about the people they are meeting. After all, they will be writing about themselves and their experience, and they will be sharing their writing. This exercise usually sets the tone.

After the small groups have talked, they introduce members of their groups to the whole class. This exchange is fascinating for the students, though it is usually routine for me: "this is Stacy and her cat just died"; "this is Jarod and his dad stays at home while his mom works." But last year one class took an odd turn: "this is Jill and she just got her belly-button pierced." The class asked to see, so Jill stood up, raised her shirt, and revealed her bejeweled belly. As the class murmured their approval someone called out, "Andrea has a tattoo," and the class demanded to see that as well. "It's not that big of a deal," Andrea explained, "but it was an impulse; I didn't even think about it. I'm not usually like that," and

she rolled up her sleeve and submitted her strand of ivy for approval. Another student announced that when Jason was born he was really big, and was delivered by forceps, and had his collarbone broken. Tara had her tongue pierced, and when she was introduced she stuck it out and wiggled it for everyone to see. My physical presence at the front of the room meant nothing. They had been writing long before they enrolled in my class. I had merely given them permission to tell their stories and they were off with a passion, demonstrating and comparing the statements, secrets, and war wounds their bodies bore.

CHAPTER 2

SEXUAL PEDAGOGY FROM THE GREEKS TO JANE GALLOP

Two of the first things young schoolchildren must learn are to stand in a line and to keep their hands to themselves. The same criteria are usually applicable to success in post-secondary education. The body must be trained or restrained in order for learning to take place and for the mind to take precedent. The validity of this assumption is the core of my analysis of *Winesburg, Ohio* and falls under the category of "critical pedagogy," which is a broad study of political and personal issues in education. My focus is on pedagogy and the body and the sensual elements of educating and learning. *Winesburg, Ohio* provides fictional accounts of pedagogical relationships and a gripping glimpse into the sensual and erotic nature of education.

In *Winesburg, Ohio*, the system of education is early modern American, but the formulation of critical pedagogy as a theory has certainly been influenced by many different time periods and cultural systems. American education has seen many changes, from the establishment of public education through the feminization of

the teaching profession.[10] Child developmental psychology entered the classroom and worked its way into teachers' lesson plans mid-century. In 1970, Paulo Freire's work on pedagogy gave the American melting pot a more pragmatic critique. Since Freire's work, the formal study of pedagogy has received international and unprecedented attention. Critical pedagogy as a theory to be interpreted did not really exist until *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.*[11] This text considers the real selves that both students and teachers bring to school and reminds educators that they are not teaching in a political or sociological vacuum. Freire's work also gave more substance to feminist theory and multicultural studies as these movements have made their way into the classroom and have evoked much dialogue within the education community and among scholars in cultural, political, and literary theory. Roger Simon and Henry Giroux have taken Freire's ideas further of late, working theory into practice. This is where the agenda seems to split between theorists and educators. Educators work more with case studies, personal narratives, and curriculum modification. Theoretical studies are rarely so pragmatic and often ignore classroom realities. Barry Kanpol's *Critical Pedagogy: An Introduction* gives narrative and practical explication of the educational experience but also includes an excellent history of the development of critical pedagogy, insisting that "critical theory and critical pedagogy are

bound inextricably" and that "the link between university professors and public school teachers is . . . vital . . . and cannot be underestimated" (27). One especially common factor is the question of the democratizing of the classroom.

Critical pedagogy is shaped by study of both the individual and the institution. To the theorist, then, the major roots of critical pedagogy are Marxism and psychoanalysis. As teachers decentralize the conventional classroom power structure, student-teacher relationships are more variable and more open to unexplored possibility. Psychoanalytic theorists look at this relationship as a case of desire, bringing up ideas concerning the basis of learning such as love, transference, the gaze, and self-actualization. Marxist theorists maintain that such questions conceal the real social constructions at work in both the classroom and the superstructure. Teresa Ebert sees what she calls "libidinal pedagogy" as an ignorance of those whose bodies labor and suffer, those who are not in a position to consider their desire. Peter McLaren successfully argues that the student's body in an educational setting has less to do with desire than with conditioning, recalling for me my original image of the child learning to stand in line and conform. He recalls Foucault in discussing the enfleshment of ideas and social conditioning of the body. In *Schooling as a Ritual Performance*, McLaren acknowledges

being profoundly struck by the influence of the unbridled culture outside of the classroom for his students. In his *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture*, he studies this phenomenon more aggressively, providing examples of the more pertinent realities for students, all dealing with the body: sex, violence, MTV, food, tattoos, piercings, and electronics, which provide more tactile experience for students than does the traditional classroom. He also points out that by way of Lacanian theory the image or sign has replaced the real thing, not just in concept but in everyday life. How can a living, speaking teacher compete with a sharper, faster, flashier, and more immediately gratifying virtual reality?

These questions bring theory back into the classroom and the currently debated answer in critical theory revolves around the teacher's body. In defensive response to Paul de Man's reprimand that teaching should be scholarly and not personal, and that teachers are not in the business of acting or counseling, many students and teachers alike have entered the ring in full support of the teacher as a spectacle, a text, a mirror, a sexuality, an ethnicity, or an object. Grumet explains that since touch and voice are discouraged in early education, "the look dominates the classroom" and is used to dominate the student bodies. Gallop and others have considered this phenomenon with regards to higher education, exploring the possible meanings a teacher's body may

reflect.[12] Such unsurpassed attention to the human element in the educational process provokes intense consideration of the teacher, at a time when educational theory is also resolving to democratize the classroom. This state of affairs has led to revelations and revolutions that the current educational system is obviously not prepared to handle. Many new and complex questions are being asked and opinions range from insightful to hostile. If an egalitarian classroom is possible, does that mean that teachers and students are free to interact as they choose? Does sexual display in an academic situation mean something different than it does in the business world or the military? Do sexual harassment policies inhibit learning or protect people who do not wish to be policed? While several studies approach this new debate from a legal angle, my aim is to provoke thought concerning more human responses to pleasure and learning.[13]

Scholars in many fields recoil at the word *pleasure* when it comes to education and reroute their questions through politics or impenetrable theory. As some feminist teachers and scholars tried to incorporate the idea of "the personal" into classroom theory, they were blind-sided by Jane Gallop's use of the term which has made "personal" a popularized euphemism for "sexual." The concept of learning being linked to pleasure seems locked in between these two extremes; it is either lost in the void of

politics and metaphor or it is Sex with a capital S. Gallop made the point that she was criticized for sexualizing the workplace. She might have explained in her defense that the classroom is already sexualized, as Ungar, Tompkins, and others have described in various ways. I hope to achieve in this dissertation what I strive to create in my classroom --an open-ended space for pleasure to take itself in many directions full of possibility. Theory and sex and everything in between fit into my idea of education.

This idea is not new, but it has been displaced or sublimated for thousands of years. There is a renewed interest in ancient Greek practices in education.[14] Naomi Scheman suggests that looking back to classical models makes it impossible for the squeamish to ignore the fact that learning and Eros work together:

> the erotic is on the scene--if not by its explicit presence, then by its conspicuous absence. And if the scene is pedagogical, the site of instruction, of knowledge and self-knowledge, the language of psychoanalysis presents itself, bidden or not. And once you're on the terrain of transference and counter-transference, there it is: students in love with (or at least drawn to) teachers, and vice-versa. A distaste for psychoanalysis, or even for modernity, won't help, either: for those more classically inclined, the Platonic

route takes us to the same destination. (106)

While Jane Gallop and bell hooks embrace that destination as erotic, many theorists contain the connection between learning and Eros within the context of teaching and feminist politics, keeping the erotic under sharp watch. Margot Culley propounds the fact that women are expected to be nurturers and for this reason are placed in the role of teacher and are considered safe and comforting creatures upon whom a student may rest. Grumet also employs the substitute parent theory, pointing out that children learn through love and sensation, and that an older student's feelings are most likely to be of the same kind. Shoshana Felman, among many others, treats student-teacher love as a transference and counter-transference, pointing out the connection between this relationship and the relationship of analysand and analyst. The psychotherapeutic relationship is, indeed, also a setting for learning, desire, seduction, self-actualization, and often eventual rebellion, anger, and separation.[15] This is similar to what one might find in an intense learning environment, especially between one student and one mentor.

This type of relationship was par for the course in Socratic education, and while many look to this as a golden age of education, Jane Gallop makes serious play of the term "to socratize" and exposes the open atmosphere of pederasty that has often been

purposefully overlooked in the study of Greek civilization.[16] If erotic relations have always been present in what western culture considers quality education, then is the sexual relationship not the crux of a glorious learning experience? For some, it may be. But in the past the truth may not have been as easily observed as the sex. And in most literature involving sexuality and education the focus has been on the titillation of exploitation in the plausible guise of education. In the Sadean literature Jane Gallop has analyzed, she speaks of sexual education of the student's body, which is still a popular motif in pornography, and the digital "exams" students underwent.

In Plato's time, literature, art, and historical documents displayed love and education openly; it was expected, and did not need to be channeled through pornography. Power relations were clear and honored. Democracy in the classroom was inconceivable. Older scholars in the community were to be humored if not revered, and they had the power to win the affection of resistant young men. By the time women were given access to education, the historic denial of female sexuality made intimate relationships between a lady teacher and a schoolgirl seem unsensational.

It is the present-day concern with the abuse of power that has brought sexual issues to the fore. Sexual coercement, of children, of co-workers or employees, of family members, has

compelled the United States government to create policies concerning appropriate intervention for any act that may be sexual harassment. However, power dynamics are not clearly defined even in the workplace. Can an employee sexually harass an employer? Further, does such legislation infringe on a person's right to make thoughtful decisions about his or her feelings? Were these laws designed with the realization that they not only provided protection but that they also forbade natural human response to affection? How democratic can a classroom really be? Especially in the college classroom, these questions are practical and essential. Thus critical pedagogy, by way of psychoanalysis or classical model, theoretically and pragmatically, must consciously investigate the role of love in learning.

In 1982, *Yale French Studies* published a special issue on teaching as a genre. This collection of densely theoretical essays spawned many reactionary writings; scholars are still responding with outrage at Paul de Man's remark that "analogies between teaching and various aspects of show business or guidance counseling are more often than not excuses for having abdicated the task" (3). Scholarship and theory are by definition not pragmatic concerns, he insisted. The greatest objection to de Man's critique comes from teachers in the margins--gay teachers, ethnic teachers, feminist teachers--who have worked to make themselves

seen in educational systems for the benefit of students who might come to school seeking more than book knowledge. The entire special issue is quite theoretical; there is barely any mention of actual teaching but it certainly has given theorists and teachers more to chew in addition to Freire, and has set up a kind of pedagogical rivalry between teachers and theorists. Theories of lack and desire, narrative and psychoanalysis were invoked, and there were many references to Socratic education. One essay that came close to reifying teaching was Ungar's "The Professor of Desire," which looks to Barthes' comments on teaching to infer that teaching is necessarily intimate and physical, and that Barthes saw "the seminar space as a privileged site where Eros and knowledge converge" (81). Ungar goes on to explain that even the most dense theories concerning desire and the body can be applied to the classroom in order to show how one seeks knowledge and what kind of knowledge one seeks. Ungar does not get personal in his discussion but he does say that "a teacher who confesses or professes desire can no longer be scandalous except to those who still believe that the so-called life of the mind has nothing to do with the rest of the body" (82). Where was Steve Ungar when Jane Gallop needed him? Her proposed conference on "Sex and Teaching" was unsupported until she changed the title to "Teaching and the Personal." Most theorists and teachers who readily embrace

pedagogy of the body are those who wish to denounce the mind-body dualistic.

Of the teachers who have publicly considered the subject and acknowledged the erotic element of teaching, few propose an ethical, sensitive response. Many, however, offer insight into why the educational experience is a seductive one. John Rouse points out that a teacher may need to seduce the student into a relationship with study, and that as teachers "we reach out first, give our students a poem perhaps, inviting their response" (535). At this point, it is up to the student to direct the experience by his or her response, and that these alternating responses or "gifts" express the student's and teacher's commitment to each other. This may be rather idealistic; this model does not provide for the consequences of such a relationship or the teacher's responsibility. Robert Wexelblatt calls this erotically charged exchange a "form of courtship," pointing out that a semester is about the same length as an affair (12-13). He also relates discussing a student with a colleague who exclaimed "I want to rape her mind!" The courtship model is quite realistic, but still offers no insight as to how students feel in these cases.

Jane Tompkins refers to the "performance model" but still focuses only on the teacher's feelings, adding a wrench of irony in saying that "we are still performing for the teachers who taught

us" (655). Tompkins' discussion on the performance of teaching leads her to confess that "teaching was exactly like sex for me," but she speaks in defense of teachers, giving no consideration to the feelings of the student. Gallop and hooks brag in retrospect about seducing their teachers while they were students; few are willing to seriously and sensitively consider the erotic urges of the student in a pedagogical situation. In many cases, student "crushes" on a teacher stem from the excitement of learning and the belief that this pleasure is a kind of courtship gift from the teacher. Praise for good work can provoke feelings of pleasure and pride, and in most educational settings the student is likely to attribute all of these good feelings to the teacher rather than to himself or herself. As the object of the not only sanctioned but commanded gaze, the teacher is in the student's direct focus as pleasures and epiphanies occur. Another common situation is that a student with self-identity problems will valorize the object--the teacher--as a model. When the self-identity need involves sexuality, the student quite often "falls in love" with the teacher as an indirect way of embracing the long-denied identity. The teacher's response to a student's feelings is critically important, but there is very little guidance for this aspect of teaching.

Of course there are cases where the student or teacher simply feel sexual desire for each other that may or may not be

related to learning-desire or power-desire. Plain, old-fashioned sexism is not uncommon, as a teacher recently explained that

> the campus is seen as one step above the bar circuit . . . I was 'hit on' . . . about twice a month . . . one well-heeled, divorced older student showed up with a contract in which she promised to provide me with $30,000 a year, plus room and board, in return for sex. (This is absolutely true; I'm not exaggerating.)

Mr. Pichaske also believes that many women sign up for courses at universities as a way "to meet eligible men, not excluding her professor" (B1). Some teachers secretly indulge in the pleasure of erotic attention, while others see it as their professional duty to shut down that energy or ignore it altogether. I recently participated in a teacher discussion group in which a teacher brought up a problem--a student, after the end of the semester, had sent her flowers. She wondered whether or not to respond to the gesture, and if she did respond, should she point out that it was not appropriate. While I began to urge her to respond and to consider the gift a precious but platonic gesture unless or until it proved otherwise, I silenced myself as I realized that I was the only teacher in the meeting who was advocating this approach. Every other teacher, in a meeting of about a dozen, insisted that she ignore the gesture completely, in order not to jeopardize her

professional standards or her job. To me, response to a gift is common courtesy but apparently it has become a political move.

Other teachers may idealize, speaking passionately about "orgasms for the mind" or advocating Eros as the new god of the academy, as Mary Doll does in "Teaching as an Erotic Art": "Eros in the classroom would welcome the principles of the evolving Feminine: paradox, fluidity, sojourn, and body" (49). All of these positions need to be explored, hopefully for the benefit of the student. But with so many political and theoretical agendas it is difficult to know where the needs of the student are considered and what is to be done with their passions.

Students may benefit from the physicality of the teacher's body because it gives them a surface on which they may test their beliefs. Most feminist teachers are wary of invoking the primality of the body, and this is certainly the issue over which most feminists butt heads. While there are many excellent books and articles devoted to feminist teaching, and these studies sometimes touch on sensuality or the "personal" in teaching, very few articles focus solely on the effect of the teacher's body. Elizabeth Grosz groups feminist attitudes towards the body as egalitarian, constructionalist, and somewhat essentialist as she works to define a "corporeal feminism." One problem with developing an outline of this type of feminism is that disregarding mind-body

dualism changes the very meaning and intent of philosophy or theory. Grosz suggests that feminists resist binary readings of the body, especially in terms of gender, and look at the body as a link between the inside world and the outside world.

Intentionally or not, the teacher's body demonstrates a model of connection between the interior and the exterior through sight, sound, and touch or gesture. Feminist teachers must consciously investigate this idea because women have still not been able to rid their sex of the discrimination assigned to women in the traditional dichotomous reading of the human body in Western culture:

> this bifurcation of being is not simply a neutral division . . . dichotomous thinking necessarily hierarchizes and ranks the two polarized terms so that one becomes the privileged term and the other its suppressed, subordinated, negative counterpart. (3)

The subordinated term is simply the absence of the other (Grosz cites Lacan here) so the body is merely "what is not mind." Armed with information about this historical discrimination, women teachers are tentatively acknowledging the body in the classroom:

> do we not wish to heal patriarchy's vicious mind-body split, or at least not reinforce it? In an ideal society no such arbitrary distinction need be made . . . however, the

> classrooms in which we teach are not ideal. They are pointedly hierarchical. (Gurko 26)

Because feminist teachers try to ignore the hierarchy, feminist-oriented classrooms are fraught with confusion and mistakes. Gurko believes that feminist teachers who try to deny this aspect of teaching

> do their students a disservice. Many students are mislead into thinking the teacher more accessible than in truth she can be and are rightfully resentful when the teacher withdraws her personal attentions or finally 'pulls rank' in some way, tarnishing the intimacy that may have developed. (27)

Dale Bauer, writing on "Teachers in the Movies," also professes that the culture, if not the teacher, presents the student with a false impression of how teachers should act and what teachers can do for them. She refers to the filmic depiction of teachers as heroes who win students over with their passion and save them from certain death or lives of meaninglessness. Bauer is concerned with seductive drama with no content and Gurko is suggesting teachers not push onto students a personal, nurturing posture which they ultimately cannot fulfill to the students' satisfaction.

The current interest in desire and pedagogy is not all about

sex. It is about the desire teachers have always had to offer their passion to another. It is about the searching element of growing up and the seduction of looking to someone who seems to know how. The contemporary problem is not only the rise in attention to power displays but the fast-moving, flashy world outside the classroom, where sex, drugs, music and money matter. People want to be either satiated or on a high, not in between. The erotics of pedagogy have always been present, but now they may be crucial for competition with the quick fix. Desensitized bodies demand more stimulation and life in the fast lane leaves no time for thought and intimacy:

> touch is avoided, and sound is muted in the corridors of the nation's schools. And when touch and sound do appear, they come banging on the door, demanding to be let in, pounding with anger, flailing with violence. (Grumet 109)

Teachers must make contact through the senses and learn to deal with the repercussions that action provokes. The demand for sensation and instant gratification must be met or knowledge will have no direction and students will blame their teachers, especially those who seem to offer more than they can deliver. Touch, sound, and spectacle are particularly effective in leading learners back to their original stimuli,

desire and love.

Fortunately, there are not only histories, law, and theory to look to for answers but there are true and fictional accounts of students and teachers in love. *Winesburg, Ohio* provides some of the most intimate scenes in literature of desire between teacher and student. Furthermore, these scenes are more realistic and common than Sadean orgies and more significant than boarding school giggles. Anderson's depictions of students and teachers loving or learning together remind me of the intensity of my own educational experiences, marked not by each grade or passing year but by each hug, each epiphany, each fantasy, and each dark, soulful night of longing and thinking. Before reading Anderson's work, I thought I was "the only one" who knew of these feelings.

Because of Anderson's emphasis on communication and miscommunication through the body, pedagogy dealing with the body is most useful in reexamining *Winesburg, Ohio.* While all the characters in *Winesburg, Ohio* use their bodies for self-expression, the stories of teachers and students make the most impact on the reader. It is curious that in a town as small as Winesburg, two of the major townspeople are teachers, and yet, they have never been studied as such. Most scholarship on *Winesburg, Ohio* directs readers to Anderson's dissatisfaction with modern life and the machine, as well as the isolation of the individual, and sexual

repression. I intend to demonstrate that Anderson is more concerned with the limits of language. When characters do speak, they cannot say what they mean; their words are singular and distorted. More often than not, the villagers of Winesburg rely on touch to send their message. The students and teachers in Winesburg seem most conscious of the community's collective affliction. Words spoken, stories told, seem twisted and macabre, though the kernel of truth within the tale is often quite poignant and always very human.[17]

In singling out the body as both the topic of my treatment and as the site of fundamental instruction I must move between the major critical camps. In *Freudianism and the Literary Mind* Hoffman says that "for Anderson's villagers the body is fundamentally the medium of expression; no force can effectively silence the body without making it ugly" (245). On the other hand, *Winesburg, Ohio* takes place during the American industrial revolution, when bodies are becoming less significant; in Marxist terms, one might say there is a surplus of flesh and physical energy. In the isolated, disembodied world of a Midwestern town in early twentieth century America, that surplus energy must be accounted for; it doesn't simply go away. Relationships are intensified, often quiet yet seething. In Anderson's world of wounded loners, there is an element of seduction in most

relationships--the erotic tension of how much to give and what to give back, a lack of the words to say it, and always the unsurpassed joy when something works, if only for a moment. In terms of contemporary pedagogical relationships, the current educational system is also groping for ways to satisfy the rustling energy, the raw passion and pain students are bringing to the classroom. I offer my limited understanding as a student forever in love with my teachers, and as a teacher having walked among my pupils, responding immediately and personally to their work, transmitting through my body provocative and tender affirmations, and hoping that I will succeed in seducing my students in order to turn their gaze back to themselves.

Dr. Kable's Pocket

Dr. Kable has a message to deliver. As a mathematician, his world is filled with signs, symbols, and codes to be deciphered. To the students, it seems there is a mysterious answer that only the doctor holds. There is. It is hiding in his pocket. As Dr. Kable writes functions and solutions on the chalkboard with one hand, the other hand is cautiously guarded and confined to his pocket. If Dr. Kable lets his hand out of his pocket he might burst into flame.

Sometimes in his attempt to make a point or to clarify his solution his empty hand will slip out of his pocket and flutter from sign to sign. His small hips thrust forward a bit as he leans back to review his work--one hand on hip and one hand falsely propping up his cheek. When asked a question he will peer deeply into the chalkboard, perhaps crossing his arms and placing a finger over his lips as he thinks. He may make a small fist, hold it to his mouth, and pace back and forth. The dissatisfied look on his face means he is trying to come up with another way of putting it. Just before the problem becomes utterly clear to the students, Dr. Kable

remembers. He stops abruptly, straightens his torso and wrist, and thrusts his left hand back into his pocket. As if nailed down he becomes still and rigid; he is unsympathetic and unyielding in carrying out his lecture. Only the brightest students can keep up with him; only the most advanced understand the lesson. Hiding his impatience he begins again, his voice steady and smooth, his body as straight and still as the crisply ironed shirts hanging in his closet.

CHAPTER 3

WING'S BODY: TOUCHING AND TEACHING

Wing Biddlebaum left Pennsylvania amidst accusations of homosexuality and after a pitiable lynching. There are several critical debates over the actual nature of Wing's sexuality--some say he was a homosexual but not a child molester; others say the entire accusation was false; one critic calls Wing a pederast.[18] Wing himself is confused about the incident; he has learned only that his hands are bad. He is less than whole from restraining his body and he is floundering in his attempts to express himself without the use of his hands. He has essentially separated his body from his intellect. His spirit and his capacity for teaching suffer greatly from this separation. At one time his hands were the voice of his mind--his values and ideas--but since escaping to Winesburg his hands are only available for utilitarian acts such as berry-picking or feeding himself. In Winesburg, Wing finds freedom from the history of his hands but is castigated by his own memory of his tragedy and is bereaved by his inability to express himself ever again. In this sense he fits in well with the other inhabitants of

Winesburg, who, for various and often mysterious reasons, demonstrate a similar ineptitude.

Carol Maresca notes that there is very little dialogue in *Winesburg, Ohio* (279). Readers and critics alike can learn more about the people of Winesburg by observing their gestures than by listening to conversations. Most conversations are hesitant, incomplete, often nonsensical, and are punctuated by angry hitting and pounding or confused groping and flailing. Even loving touches, such as those between Seth and Helen, do not flow smoothly. During their walk together Helen puts her hand into Seth's hand, but he grows uncomfortable and thrusts "his hands into his trouser pockets" (140). Soon following, "a wave of sentiment swept over Helen. Putting her hand upon Seth's shoulder, she started to draw his face down toward her own upturned face" but changes her mind: " 'I think I'd better be going along,' she said, letting her hand fall heavily to her side" (142). Almost every story in *Winesburg, Ohio* contains an awkward or thwarted gesture. In fact, the entire book can be read as a story of a community for whom words have failed. As a last resort, some turn to the physical, literally groping for words or hoping that, for once, their touch will be understood. A few have given up on communication entirely, but most still try to reach out, though futilely, and many look to George Willard as a man who will become a great writer and who will explain their lives

with words they never knew existed. The villagers come to George with their bodies boiling and bursting with passions and ideas, with a vague sense that he can put everything down on paper in a way that makes meaning. The talk in Winesburg is not dialogue, rather, a series of monologues spoken by suffering people, and presented to George Willard.

One difference between Wing Biddlebaum and the other townspeople is that Wing is too frightened and humiliated to even approach George. Most members of the community seek out George. Kate Swift reaches out to George to teach him about life, with her words and her body; Tom Foster gets drunk and confides in George about his fantasies; Elmer Cowley calls for George to meet him at the depot where he tries to explain something but instead ends up beating George "half unconscious." Wing, on the other hand, merely walks nervously on his veranda, "hoping" George will come by. At one point he walks through the field of mustard weed and looks anxiously over the fence and down the road for George, but he becomes frightened and runs back to his porch (28). Though George has befriended Wing, he does not turn up on the afternoon of the story "Hands," and the reader is left seeing the pitiable shell of the lonesome Wing, suffering in the absence of George.

Anderson's decision to place "Hands" at the beginning of the body of the stories is significant in many ways. This story alerts

readers to an important theme to be developed--that the majority of the townspeople desperately depend on George for some type of emotional fulfillment. "Hands" is also important because it was, by most accounts, Anderson's favorite of his own stories.[19] Though accounts of the writing of this story vary widely, most renditions reveal that Anderson finally felt he had written a really important story with "Hands." Studies of the composition of "Hands" suggest that it was revised to downplay the homosexual aspects of the story.[20] Though a solid homosexual or pederastic reading of Wing has yet to be written, White's article "Socrates in Winesburg" and recent studies in critical pedagogy give critics a legitimate angle from which to view Wing Biddlebaum as a homosexual teacher. Most homosexual readings of the story rely heavily on the similarities between Wing and Socrates. Though my work deals primarily with Wing as a teacher who once taught through touch and who has now abandoned the sensuality of teaching, the Socratic nature of Wing's story does make a comparison fruitful.[21]

Anderson's narration clearly implies a Socratic mood. Anderson writes that Wing is lost in a dream where "men lived again in a kind of pastoral golden age. Across a green open country came clean-limbed young men . . . to gather about the feet of an old

man who sat beneath a tree in a tiny garden and who talked to them (30). Wing's dream is sensual and free, but the possibility of such a setting was ruined for Wing in Pennsylvania by lies and homophobia. Wing, who once utilized love and touch in his teaching, will never teach again. He is incapable of expressing his thoughts and feelings without the medium of touch and has basically separated the functions of his mind from those of his body. This condition leaves him isolated, fearful, and confused. He never understood what caused the lynching in Pennsylvania, only that "the hands must be to blame" (33). When he leaves Pennsylvania and gives up his identity, he gives up his whole being because of his inability to recognize the true nature of his sexuality, which informs his method of his teaching. The narrator describes Wing as looking twenty-five years older than his actual age of forty. This, too, is a sign that the broken man readers meet in "Hands" is not the inspired and animated schoolmaster he once was. His false identity in Winesburg parallels the lack of identity from which he always suffered.

One major difference between Wing and Socrates that has been overlooked by critics who investigate the connections between the two teachers is that, though the background of Wing's tragedy is similar to the story of Socrates, who was accused of corrupting youth, Socrates is known to have been aware of the

erotic nature of learning and the function of desire in a pedagogical relationship. Wing is not even able to acknowledge his own sexuality, let alone the role that his sexuality might play in his teaching. When Wing--then Adolph Myers--was a teacher in Pennsylvania he was much loved by his students, the narrator of *Winesburg, Ohio* recounts. He touched his boys lovingly and frequently in a way that was intended "to carry a dream into the young minds" (31). As with Socrates, these relationships extended outside the classroom; often Adolph Myers walked with the boys in the evening, as he later does with George, or sat talking with them on the schoolhouse steps until dusk. As Mr. Myers talked and taught, "here and there went his hands, caressing the shoulders of the boys, playing about the tousled heads . . . his voice became soft and musical. There was a caress in that also" (31).

Such a teaching style involves a desire on the teacher's part to mold and guide and nurture youth literally through touch. Contemporary critics and educators must address the issue of sexual harassment, but for Socrates, the issue was more a question of teaching method. There is a valid tradition in education of reaching toward beauty and knowledge from the prompt of Eros.[22] Distinctions are made in critical pedagogy between using desire as a natural impetus and acting on that desire with the idea that knowledge can be transmitted best with the inclusion of a physical

element. Either position can be extended to embrace the notion of inserting knowledge into a student's body or mind--to "socratize" the student. Socrates acknowledged that love and desire play an important part in learning; he encouraged physical contact and valorized love between teachers and students. But he had great disdain for the method of teaching in which one person transmitted knowledge to another, either pedantically or pederastically. It was Socrates' desire that a young man improve himself and discover his own wisdom without being told what to think. Several documented stories present Socrates' opinion on the subject of teaching and touching and show that he respected the drive of erotic feeling in teacher-student relationships.[23]

Though there is disagreement concerning the extent to which Socrates employed erotic love in his teaching, by most accounts, Socrates at least allowed students who were in love with him to touch him and hold him. Alcibiades spent the night under Socrates' cloak embracing him, but "nothing more happened" (Kaplan 228-29). Another young man, Aristides, professed to learning best when he could be near Socrates: "the greatest progress of all I made when I actually sat next to you and could touch you" (Guthrie 80). In Plato's *Symposium*, Agathon begs to recline by Socrates so he may touch him and thereby benefit from Socrates' wisdom. To this request Socrates moved to be near

Agathon but replied, "how I wish . . . that wisdom could be infused by touch" (Kaplan 170). Socrates continues, and makes use of the analogy of filling an emptier man with the substance of the fuller man. He speaks of this concept as if it were a pleasant fantasy, with the realization that gaining true knowledge is not so simple.

Though according to Anderson's story Wing has not had sex with any of his students, he does seem to believe in the pedagogical fantasy that he can fill the young, empty boys with his thoughts and ideas. Socrates encouraged intimacy in student-teacher relationships, but rebuked the notion that one person could instill knowledge in another. In Plato's *Apology*, Socrates denies that he ever taught anyone anything (28). This belief is reinforced by Aristides, an enamored student who says to Socrates: "*I never learned a single thing from you*, as you know yourself; but whenever I was with you I improved" (Guthrie 80). Teloh's study of Socratic education holds to the thesis that Socrates did not wish to force his beliefs upon any young man; rather, his goals were to "instill the desire to seek truth" and to "give one a method by which truth may be sought" (152). He worked only with young men whom he felt were able to discover their own truths, and he worked comfortably and intimately with these young men. His companions often commented upon Socrates' admirable restraint, in drink and in other pleasures of the flesh. However, it is also clear from

Socrates' own revelations that he was "by nature a lover" and that he had a difficult time resisting the "youthful beauty" of the young men under his tutelage. What Guthrie describes as the "most outspoken passage" is Socrates' proposal to test the spirit and intellect of the beautiful young Charmides by engaging him in conversation:

> my former confidence that I could make conversation with him was all knocked out of me . . . he turned his eyes on me with an indescribable look and made as if to question me . . . I caught a glimpse inside his clothes and was aflame. I was no longer master of myself. (74)

This acknowledgement of pedagogical passion is part of the "pastoral golden age" for which Wing pines. But Wing is unaware of his homoerotic relationships with his students and is therefore unable to channel Eros consciously and responsibly. The dreams he wishes to instill in the boys' minds are his own dreams, both intellectual and erotic; these ideas seep into his teaching. Though he is gentle and unthreatening to the boys, his lack of power over his longing is conveyed through his teaching. His fluttering hands and his gentle demeanor give him away. Anderson's narrator tells the reader that Wing is the kind of man whose love for boys is "not unlike the finer sort of women in their love of men" (31).

Ray Lewis White insists that the reader must take only the

evidence Anderson presents, and that "Wing Biddlebaum is so innocent that he has never comprehended and can never comprehend the nature of the accusation against him" (*Exploration* 57). However, it is precisely Wing's innocence that prevents Wing from being the outstanding teacher he could be. He does not understand the accusation, so he does not have a way to defend himself. Anderson presents the story of the parents' homophobia with deep sympathy for Wing. Anderson had met many homosexuals in his stay in Chicago and was even propositioned on at least one occasion. He reports in his autobiographical works that he held a sincere desire to understand homosexuals and that he was always concerned with gender identity and gender roles. Anderson witnessed the difficult lives of homosexual men and women and has spoken with tenderness of his character Wing, saying that he has known many men like Wing Biddlebaum.[24]

But Wing does not possess any inner guidance over his love because he does not understand it. He does not grant special attention to boys with truth-seeking potential, but loves and caresses all of his students. As he strokes shoulders and runs fingers through hair (31), he transmits to his students what he himself needs to learn. This type of teaching is a kind of self-therapy through which Wing sublimates the truth about his sexuality. One young man perceives Wing's truth and uses it to

construct, not a dream, but a fantasy. Wing's use of this method of teaching is not necessarily harmful to the students or the teacher. But Wing had no authority over his sexuality and therefore no respect for its power in regards to teaching. The student's fantasy leads to Wing's being beaten and chased out of town by the parents of the community. Wing had unconsciously conveyed his helplessness to them, too: "hidden, shadowy doubts that had been in men's minds concerning Adolph Myers were galvanized into beliefs" (32). The last image the reader has of Wing in Pennsylvania is that of "the figure that screamed and ran faster and faster into the darkness" (33). This is both reminiscent of and opposite to Socrates' words in his final confrontation with his accusers: "the difficulty, my friends, is not to avoid death, but to avoid unrighteousness; for that runs faster than death" (Kaplan 36). The men in Pennsylvania "had intended to hang the schoolmaster, but something in his figure, so small, white, and pitiful, touched their hearts and they let him escape," though they still threw sticks and mud at him as he ran (32). Unlike Socrates, Wing proves himself not even worthy of a hanging; he outruns death with his unrighteousness. He dare not confront his accusers just as he has never faced his sexuality. Wing is not only a failure as a teacher but a failure as a man. This is proved again in Winesburg.

After fleeing Pennsylvania and giving up teaching,

Wing engages himself in berry-picking, for which he becomes somewhat of a novelty about the town--

> Winesburg was proud of the hands of Wing Biddlebaum in the same spirit in which it was proud of Banker White's new stone house and Wesley Moyer's bay stallion, Tony Tip, that had won the two-fifteen trot at the fall races in Cleveland. (29)

But Wing's hands more naturally worked within the realm of teaching, when he had ideas and passions to express. His hands are so expressive that even as a berry-picker they give him away as someone different: "they made more grotesque an already grotesque and elusive individuality" (29), and Wing in turn "looked with amazement at the quiet inexpressive hands of other men who worked beside him in the fields" (29). Wing is aware that his hands are different from other men's hands, but he is perplexed as to what the difference signifies. He struggles to control and hide his hands, using them only in manual work and tasks, but occasionally, when George Willard comes to visit him, his hands steal forward.

Wing recognizes George as a potential student, and depends on George to listen to him: "in the presence of George Willard, Wing Biddlebaum . . . lost something of his timidity, and his shadowy personality . . . came forth to look at the world" (28). Wing needs the medium of teaching to process his thoughts, to stay human and

sane. Living under a pseudonym, berry-picking instead of teaching, Wing is not quite functional, but with

> the young reporter at his side . . . the voice that had been low and trembling became shrill and loud. The bent figure straightened. With a kind of wriggle, like a fish returned to the brook by the fisherman, Biddlebaum the silent began to talk. (28)

However, it is really the humanity of the touch that Wing needs in order to function. When he speaks to George, it makes him feel more comfortable if he pounds his fists upon a table or fence, or against the walls of his house (29). By the Socratic standard of instilling the desire in a student to seek out knowledge, Wing fails miserably, even with George. George had many times wanted to ask Wing about his hands. But on one afternoon, when he had been at the point of asking, Wing's behavior prevents him:

> Wing Biddlebaum became wholly inspired. For once he forgot about the hands. Slowly they stole forth and lay upon George Willard's shoulders. Something new and bold came into the voice that talked. (30)

It is the touching that brings a boldness back to Wing. But his fears distort his passion and corrupt his message. He cannot produce the desired effect of bringing students to a love of learning. Instead, he brings on only a desire to avoid learning: "with a shiver of dread the

boy arose . . . 'I'll not ask him about his hands,' he thought . . . 'there's something wrong, but *I don't want to know* what it is'" (31) (emphasis added).

Most critics have looked at Wing's plight as punishment for his homosexuality or have studied Wing as a victim and, as such, a paradigm of the entire book. But comparing Wing to Socrates provides more than an analysis of Wing's sexuality. Readers would benefit from looking at Wing's teaching methodology. Wing's inability to acknowledge the sensual element of learning transforms his teaching style into one of dueling desperation and repression. Concerning Wing's younger charges, the reader knows only that he touched them gently and frequently and that he was very much loved by the pupils. With George, one is able to get an up-close view of Wing's actions. When Wing is with George he becomes earnest and passionate:

> his eyes glowed. Again he raised his hands to caress the boy and then a look of horror swept over his face. With a convulsive movement of his body, Wing Biddlebaum sprang to his feet and thrust his hands into his trousers pockets. Tears came to his eyes. (30)

With that he hurries away and leaves George alone, "perplexed and frightened" (31). Wing's teaching method as observed with George does not promote a desire to learn, only an intellectual recoil and a

feeling of abandonment.

According to Guthrie, first contact with Socrates tended to leave students with "a depressing sense of helplessness" as Socrates caused them to see their own faults (81), and many students grew angry with Socrates and left him and his teaching in what a "psychoanalyst might call a state of negative transference" (82). In "Hands" one learns that it was a "half-witted boy" who accused Mr. Meyers of sexual provocation and that for the other boys the teacher's touch sent "doubt and disbelief" away from their minds. Several times the narrator states that it would take "a poet" to explain Adolph Meyer's hands--how they moved, how they were connected to his teaching and his self-expression. The narrator also states that it was an obscure poet in the town of Winesburg who gave Wing his nickname, after the image of a captured, fluttering bird. In addition to his fluttering hands, Wing paces on his veranda like a captive animal. He is nervous and self-conscious about his hands and he conveys that fear to others. Wing's body obviously conveyed to other members of both of the communities in which he lived that he was "different." Just as the people of Winesburg notice his hands as his distinguishing feature, in Pennsylvania the parents of the community focused on his hands: "he felt that the hands must be to blame. Again and again the fathers of the boys had talked of the hands. 'Keep your hands to

yourself,' the saloon keeper had roared, dancing with fury in the schoolhouse yard" (33). Wing almost always refers to his hands as "the" hands, demonstrating his own disembodiment. By not accepting his own hands Wing thinks he can not confront what the hands signify. Everyone in the story but Wing has some reading of his hands; he is a bird, a beast, a woman, a homosexual, a novelty. In the context of the whole work he is a "grotesque."

Wing is either unwilling or unable to accept the truth of his hands and their signification--his homosexuality. Other characters see his truth through his body, particularly his hands, and use Wing's truth to fulfill their own inadequacy, their own misapprehension of truth. In the prologue, "The Book of the Grotesque," the narrator explains that in the beginning there were many truths and they were all beautiful. But people began to "snatch up" the truths, and "the moment one of the people took one of the truths to himself, called it his truth, and tried to live his life by it, he became a grotesque and the truth he embraced became a falsehood" (24). In Wing's case, it is the fact that someone else embraces his truth that creates the grotesque. Because Wing has no consciousness of his sexuality, it is left for the reading of others; Wing has no chance to see the beauty of his truth for he does not see it at all. It is "snatched up" by the student who imagines "unspeakable things" in his bed at night and who goes

forth and tells his reading of *a* truth as *the* truth, distorted with "strange, hideous accusations" (32).

Had Wing been able to acknowledge his own truth and control and utilize the erotic nature of his love for boys he might have opened their minds to more than mere fantasy but to real, beautiful dreams and ideas. Further, as an embodied role model, Wing could have provided valuable insight and comfort for young students who might be homosexual. The poetic nature of his hands, his passion for life and for teaching, and his homosexuality could have modeled self-awareness and self-respect. Karamcheti, Jay ("Taking"), and Litvak all provide excellent examples of "reading" the body of the teacher; Litvak puns with the word *educate* as *outing*. If the teacher's body is the focal point of the gaze it is hopefully a positive display. Wing's body displayed fear, and even in contemporary educational settings, this is a common occurrence. Jane Tompkins explains that her modeling in the classroom is driven by fear: "my own fear . . . must transmit itself to my students, and insofar as I was afraid to be exposed, they too would be afraid" (654). Besner and Spungin argue for more support for gay students and for gay visibility, and Daphne Patai explains that traditionally marginalized groups must choose between invisibility or what the dominant group deems "excessive" visibility. Because some bodies and behaviors display "otherness," they are considered

offensive to the majority. The classroom is the place most conducive to dispelling that atmosphere; unfortunately, few teachers or students are willing to take the risk.

In Winesburg, most, if not all, of the people are unwilling to see the beauty of their own truths. This not only makes them grotesques, but gives them an ugly, disparate view of the world. Before Wing had the life beaten out of him, his body soared with a beautiful truth. He is not destroyed as a victim of false accusation and he is not destroyed as punishment for a crime. He is destroyed by loneliness because he has no words with which to explain himself. He shrivels and kneels and eats crumbs with his hands, still hungering "for the presence of the boy" (33), because he believes he needs the body of another to express his "love of man." Because he does not trust his own body to convey that love, he leaves himself vulnerable to others' interpretation of his body. A teacher's body is always exposed as the center of attention in a classroom. No matter how the teacher moves, gestures, dresses, he or she is always a model of physicality or sexuality to the students. A teacher's body keeps the attention of the student and conveys a message. In Wing's case, the message conveyed was one of love, but also the tension of repression. A dubious teaching method in the case of one so blind to the power of his sexuality, Wing's caresses carry tidings of fear and anger back to him, and he

never realizes why.

In all the comparisons of Wing and Socrates, homosexuality is the focus rather than teaching. Ironically, Socrates' own disclaimer concerning instilling knowledge in others is questionable. The Socratic teaching model involves intense, one-to-one mentoring as well as the system known as Socratic dialogue, which is really only a series of leading questions to which the answer is usually, "Yes, Socrates," until the student finally, and apparently on his own, comes to a moment of insight; that is, he comes to see the matter from Socrates' view. It can be argued that this teaching method is no more student-oriented than outright proselytizing. Socrates and Wing Biddlebaum may have more in common than simply a love for young boys. They both seem to need the mind and body of another to feel self-worth as teachers and to feel that their dreams and beliefs constitute truth.

Wing and Socrates, like many teachers, wish that their carefully considered ideas can be passed down from one man to another. This is a part of the counter-transference in a pedagogical relationship. Both student and teacher possess desires which they hope to have met. Often, teachers long for a word or a visit from a certain student with whom they wish to make essential contact. Sometimes a student will approach a teacher in a way that the teacher does not welcome; sometimes students touch teachers.

Touching is a powerful teaching tool that must be used carefully. Some students need and want to be touched and consider it an integral part of their learning process while other students recoil from touching. The response probably depends less on the student's feelings for the teacher and more on the student's past experience with learning. The teacher should watch the student as closely as the student watches the teacher, and learn to read these messages. When students and teachers can really communicate with one another, they will usually find a balance that allows both persons' needs to be met. In any case, the student is always watching the teacher and even without the use of touch is always learning from the teacher's body how to live.

Would Linda Leavell Wear This?

It was MLA season and Sharon and I went clothes shopping together. There were so many things to consider as we looked for "professional" clothing. Besides cost and flexibility, there were color codes, static, style, and comfort. We had individual needs and preferences but we agreed that the first and final point of criteria was an answer to the question "would Linda Leavell wear this?" This factor was understood immediately and mutually, without any doubt. Dr. Leavell was not just a model; her clothing and carriage meant something that we, as young, professional women and as students, could understand. Nearly blinded by polyester ties and tweed jackets, we could look at Dr. Leavell and see compromise, cotton, and compassion, which gave us hope and empowerment as professionals. As students, we got through graduate school relatively intact by looking at Dr. Leavell's gestures, colors, fabrics, and natural demeanor for reassurance and guidance. When she taught us in class, her manner was inviting yet presenting clearly marked boundaries. Her voice was simultaneously soothing and provoking. Her hands were as graceful and as disciplined as those of a pianist. We watched her with delight, but also with

attentiveness in order to learn what the body of a teacher could be.

We learned style and statement, but most of all we learned choice. A teacher chooses her or his message. Being comfortable in one's body is the most significant statement, but there are more subtle messages as well. Solids convey authority. There is sensitive compassion in lavender. A teacher can be eroticized and still taken seriously. A teacher can nurture to empower, not to smother. Shoplifters will be prosecuted. Enroll in one of Dr. Leavell's classes and own yourself.

Sharon holds a skirt up against the front of her jeans. "Would Linda Leavell wear this? With tights and maybe a red sweater?" "Hmmm, what kind of sweater?" "A cardigan, over a cotton knit." "Yes, she might wear that," I answer pensively. By the end of the day we have maxed out our credit cards and are exhausted from fits of shrieking laughter as we have held up outrageous articles of clothing that Linda Leavell would never, ever wear. We leave the mall to find our car and discover that the first snow of the season is falling. We scrape ice off the windows. Our cheeks and fingers are bright red with winter and we drive home with our trunk full of our "Linda Leavell clothes," ready for the conference, ready for the cold.

CHAPTER 4

KATE'S BODY: THE PEDAGOGY OF THE UNDRESSED

I can say nothing truthful about Kate Swift. Anderson's best attempt to describe her was in saying "she was a teacher but she was also a woman" (164-65). Kate Swift is the thing that is missing; she is a symbol for what no one can quite grasp. She is the nagging vacancy at the center of each near-epiphany; the vision of the drunken stranger who tells a five-year-old "be brave enough to dare to be loved. Be something more than man or woman" (145).[25] The stranger calls it "Tandy"; the Reverend calls it "God." George first misses it completely, but later realizes what Kate had to say to him though he is still unable to name it.

Anderson places his inarticulate characters in the most central roles of his stories. Biographers and critics never fail to point out Anderson's personal war with words. He wanted to write, yet felt he must make some kind of living from writing, so he turned to advertisement, writing sales' pitches. Consequently, "Anderson came to associate words themselves with lies"; he often felt that words "could be used for no other purpose" (Ward

36). Thus the reader may assume that when George is unable to say what he has missed from Kate's message, this is a positive sign. George will likely discard words, as Kate has told him to, and will learn to feel, and to be able to know what people are thinking, not what they are saying. This resort to silence or to physical explosions is viewed frequently as one surveys the interactions among characters in Winesburg. The "untold lie" is what Anderson tries to portray with the character Kate.

There are very few studies of the female characters in Winesburg in spite of the centrality of both the mother figure (Elizabeth) and the teacher figure.[26] It is likely a point of embarrassment to scholars that Anderson's depictions of women are so idealized or even sexist, Kate being the "tiny goddess on a pedestal." Anderson has definite "types" of women--"loose," "frigid," "desperate," "dependent"--generally unfulfilled. He also does tend to idealize women, in his personal life as well as in his fiction. However, I propose that he innocently believes women know something which he can never know. By contemporary standards this naivete is difficult to defend. In 1968, citing only male references, Chris Browning lauds Anderson's uplifting of Woman as the Creative Eros. By 1987, Judith Arcana speaks of the "curse" of "pedestalization" and of the image of the woman as an endlessly full vessel from which man may drink and sustain

himself. Most essays on Anderson and women focus on the connections between his female characters and his female companions in real life. Marilyn Judith Atlas says that "by exploring the lives of the women in Winesburg we explore the biases of a period . . . and an author" (264-65).

Though most critics have tossed Kate onto the pile of rejects--the "grotesques"--who are incapable of reaching their potential, it is important to note that Anderson's ineptitude at expressing the truth is the poignancy of his task. He reveals this inadequacy with the story "Tandy," when the drunkard passing time in Winesburg tells Tom Hard's young daughter to "be something more than man or woman" (145). The character also chides during his drunken rambling that "they think it's easy to be a woman, to be loved, but I know better" (145). These wisest words concerning gender roles are spoken by a drunkard to a child who is too young to understand his vision. This situation underscores my contention that it is the theme of inexpressibility that motivates Anderson's story, though he does naively idealize women in the process of his work. While seen by most as simply another unfulfilled woman along with the many others in *Winesburg, Ohio*, Kate Swift actually has lived a zestful life and has had more opportunities than any other woman in Anderson's collection of stories:

> Although no one in Winesburg would have expected it,

> her life had been very adventurous. It was still adventurous . . . the people of the town thought of her as a confirmed old maid and because she spoke sharply and went her own way thought her lacking in all the human feeling that did so much to make and mar their lives. In reality she was the most eagerly passionate soul among them. (162)

At the time the reader meets Kate, much of the adventure of her life is over but she is still full of passion. Kate has never been closely examined as a teacher, which is where her strength lies. Perhaps Kate has been out in the world and has come to Winesburg to escape from adventure. Still, she has much to give.

This wise teacher urges George to "stop fooling with words" (163). When the reader last sees Kate Swift, she is praying, naked, and weeping. The following story in *Winesburg, Ohio* suggests that she is desolate over her inability to communicate with George Willard. In actuality, Kate has started George thinking and she has led more people to insight than is likely in the small community of workers and breeders. Many citizens have come to George only to find that he has no answers and is completely baffled by the townspeople's demands and questions. Kate is the comfortably placed schoolteacher who gives little indication that there is any kind of excitement about her. George, on the other

hand, is the sophomoric writer--the adventurer who will leave Winesburg and tell everyone what the world is about. But the prompt behind George's act and his greatest inspiration to seek truth is his teacher, Kate Swift. Stereotypically, Kate falls into several female roles, and the modest, no-nonsense schoolteacher behind whom hides a sexual wildcat is the role in which Anderson feels the need to place her. Despite Anderson's attempts to define her and George's misunderstanding of her desire, in the role of the teacher she is at her most successful. She understands and controls her sexual desire but readily demonstrates that love and learning coexist: Kate's desire "to open the door of life" to George was so strong that "it became something physical" (164) which is an important lesson to teach.

When Kate is teaching, her "biting and forbidding" character becomes passionate and beautiful; the children sit "back in their chairs and look at her" (161). She "was not known in Winesburg as a pretty woman" (160) but when she shares her passion with George he becomes "aware of the marked beauty of her features" (164). Kate does not touch the children in her classroom who lack the maturity to understand what she carries within; instead, she walks "up and down in the schoolroom," her "hands clasped behind her back." The reader is told she is stern, "yet in an odd way very close to her pupils" (161). Indeed the youngsters in her care often did not

understand her--she sometimes made up stories that confused them, and once made a boy laugh so hard that "he became dizzy and fell off his seat" (162). After this Kate quickly resumed control of the atmosphere of the classroom.

With young students the teacher's body is gazed upon as a mother's body might be. Kate's body must serve as a model of seriousness and control in order to teach children attentiveness and reserve. Children are schooled in order to be trained in facts, but primarily to be taught the difference between public and personal behavior. Kate does not touch her students or seduce them into learning. Rather, she is a model of restraint and public behavior. To look at the teacher's body is an instinctual gaze, going back to the early learning experiences Grumet explains in *Bitter Milk* when a baby and parent look into each other's eyes. Intentionality, desire, and "the capacity to symbolize" are learned through the gaze. Touch is retrained in school; the body must surrender in order to be educated though the eye may continue to wander. When the child is quiet and still, then learning can begin. In the room full of children, Kate is clothed and physically inaccessible. She is aware of the power of the body to send messages and uses that power appropriately. With the voyeuristic Reverend, she is powerless, and with George Willard she uses her body's passion in a different way. Kate and George are on more equal ground because

they are both adults. Kate enjoys speaking with George and allows her body to respond with the power of pleasure.

Outside the classroom, or in a decentered classroom, it is not the gaze so much as the touch, the sound, and sensual possibility that the teaching body conveys. In my classes I walk through the room or sometimes sit with the students. I do not touch my students but I do touch their work, stand close beside them or lean over them, and I know they are aware of my physical self. When I am among my students rather than in front of them, my talk is quite different from my lecture speech. I am, of course, closer to them and I am relaxed. I realize that they can smell my body and that they are quite responsive to sound or touch. I answer questions that they might be hesitant to ask out loud. I comment on their work, giving praise and making suggestions. I am more likely to give examples from my experience, more likely to laugh, more likely to reveal my memory lapses or thinking process. The novelty of having the spectacle move among them conveys a physical and emotional diversion.

Teachers' bodies convey messages that alert students to the teacher's availability as a guide or confidant, the teacher's attitude toward her or his subject, or even toward the confines of the environment in which they are teaching and learning. The teacher's body naturally becomes objectified as he or she stands in front of

the class, presumably with something to profess. This occurs whether the teacher is a woman or a man. Anything that is stared at constantly, especially with the inclusion of some type of need, may become objectified. This object may become eroticized or even fetishized. Working from Barthes' and Goffman's theories of teaching and lecturing, Arthur W. Frank analyzes the effect of image, animation, and nondisclosure in the effectiveness of the lecture. The appearance of accessibility makes a teacher a valued object, even though the student may never receive what he or she wants from the teacher's lecture. While books or video tapes of lectures may be more efficient methods of getting information to the student, there is a belief that more is gained from a live delivery. Actually, it is this belief and the subsequent objectification of the embodied teacher that brings out a student's awareness of lack. For a variety of reasons, the student comes to the classroom expecting to encounter "the subject presumed to know," which, Lacan explains, causes desire and, through transference, love.

Frank hopes that this awareness can bring students to a position of asking on their own what they want from the teacher. Some students want knowledge and, finding that to be a gift freely offered by the teacher, are then consumed with love and gratitude. Other students do not know what they want; they gaze without a

preconceived agenda. The success of the ritual of lecture depends on the physical presence of the teacher and the student's desire. Frank offers the experience of his own "perpetual fascination" when students come to his office to "see" him: "I ask them what questions they have. I gradually realize they have no specific questions; they only want, quite literally, to *see* me . . . as if that contact could confer something" (29-30). In my experience with this encounter, I find that, lacking a way to express or even know what they want, students will then resort to asking about their grade. Frank suggests that grades and tests are really a "cover" for the intangibles of teaching and learning. The interplay of desire and ego is the underlying substance. In this psychological drama, "the professor has a moral responsibility to help students to move on, but not *vice versa*" (35). Roger Simon makes a similar point, that "pedagogy [is] a form of seduction" and that "as a teacher, it is important to acknowledge one's eroticization, to realize that one's actions matter to students" (Face to Face 99).

Kate takes on this responsibility when she decides to reach out to George, a former student. Kate seeks out and touches George because "in something he had written as a school boy she thought she had recognized the spark of genius and wanted to blow on the spark" (162-63). More than once she had met George at his office or taken him out for walks during which she tried to talk to him

about being a writer. In almost the same words employed with the description of George's meetings with Wing, Anderson says Kate "tried to bring home" some concept to the "boy" and earnestly took George by the shoulders and "turned him about so that she could look into his eyes. A passer-by might have thought them about to embrace" (163). In response to Wing's excited gesture and accompanying panic, George had become afraid, and had backed away from the teacher. Kate grabs George just as passionately but says with sensitivity: "I don't want to frighten you, but I would like to make you understand" (163). Kate is the more responsible and knowledgeable teacher. Wing tries to tell George not to be afraid of dreams, though he himself is terrified by them. Kate tries to tell George not to be afraid of living, and she has the experience, the reader has been told, to know what she is saying.

Another comparison to Wing exposes the contrast. Kate recognizes that her desire to teach George is accompanied by a sexual desire. She believes this is a force that can help George if he is mature enough to understand it, which at the time he is not. Still, Kate is aware of the capacities of passion; "the impulse that had driven her out into the snow poured itself out into talk" (164). She is conscious of her feelings and acknowledges them, lightly, and hesitantly--"in a moment, if I stay, I'll be wanting to kiss you" (164)--but controls them, first simply then with confusion and

disappointment as she sees George is not ready to understand what she means. Wing, on the other hand, has no conscious understanding of his passions and therefore no ability to acknowledge or decide what to do with them. Wing's suppression of his erotic feelings toward his students detracts from his teaching. Tragedy occurs when Wing unconsciously conveys this nameless doubt to his students. If Wing had accepted his sexuality, he could have chosen to use the power of desire to make himself a better teacher. Instead, Wing makes his students distrustful, not only of him but of their own perception of their learning experience, as might a victim of sexual harassment in an academic setting.

Kate Swift possesses an awareness of Eros and intellect, and has the ability to instill in her students the desire to keep seeking, even after the teacher and student have parted. She educates in the true sense of the word--to lead one out. She leads George out of Winesburg and she leads the Reverend Hartman out of spiritual despair, not because she transfers her knowledge to them but because through her they each create their own truth. These truths involve real life and real bodies. The groping in Winesburg becomes strong or still for a few moments as it finds something to hold on to.

Kate never learns of the effect she has had on George. She knows something of the desire she aroused in him but never sees

him mature: "what's the use? It will be ten years before you begin to understand what I mean when I talk to you" (164). In spite of his initial immaturity, Kate has blown on the spark in George. She inspires him to desire and explore mature love, and to read, think, and question. George's sexual response to Kate's passion has provoked his drive to know. The reader sees this several times after George's fumbling encounter with Kate. He tells Helen, "I've been reading books and I've been thinking" (236), likely books that Kate frequently brought to his office. Only hours after lying on his bed fantasizing about Kate and Helen (158), he lay awake until four o'clock in the morning thinking, not fantasizing, and trying to understand. The arm that had earlier embraced a pillow now reached upward and with his hand George groped in the darkness, feeling an urgency deeper than his sexual one had been. The desire to feel like a man became the desire to know all he still needed to learn: "I have missed something. I have missed something Kate Swift was trying to tell me" (166). George recognizes that whatever he missed he will have to learn for himself. He passes the search for this unnameable thing on to Helen, in a speech very similar to the one of the drunken man in "Tandy":

> I want you to do something, I don't know what. Perhaps it is none of my business. I want you to try to be different from other women. You see the point. It's

> none of my business I tell you. I want you to be a beautiful woman. You see what I want. (236-37)

In the cycle of good teaching, Helen, now, must miss what George is trying to tell her; she must discover it for herself. Under Wing's tutelage a young boy imagined unspeakable things in his bed at night. The drunken stranger's pupil wept with desire for knowledge and would not be consoled. There was no way of knowing "what woman's thoughts" (242) went through Helen's mind, but as for George "he slept and in all Winesburg he was the last soul on that winter night to go to sleep" (166).

Kate intuitively reveals enough of herself to aid the instruction of each student who is ready to learn. She is a guide and not a "socratizer" who insists on placing her knowledge within the student's mind or body. She exposes nothing extraordinary as she teaches young children, guarding her body and keeping a barrier between it and the bodies of the students. She does not touch her young students as Wing does, and she does not have to; they sit back in their seats and look at her. She is not accountable for the Reverend's voyeurism because she is in her apartment, where she has a right to undress and unbind her body. She does not invite eroticization but she has some sense of its possibility, exhibited in the fact that she makes a conscious decision to touch George but

not her current students. In fact, Kate does not touch anyone but George, though her body, dressed and undressed, is an erotic focal point for many who observe it. Kate is full of passion, while some teachers are disinterested and therefore not compelling enough to instill desire or capture the gaze.

George had never really looked at Kate until she made the move to touch him. When he did look, he found her to be very beautiful. Anderson makes it clear that it is the passion of her teaching that beautifies Kate, but never suggests that Kate is a desperate old maid. She has known passion and she has had adventures. It is her intense desire to have George understand life that sweeps over her and becomes physical. She touches George deliberately, not with Wing's flightiness. It is emotional eagerness and a trick of light--"in the lamplight George Willard looked no longer a boy, but a man ready to play the part of a man"--(165) that causes Kate to become aroused by George. But with the Reverend Hartman it is entirely the essence of Kate that teaches and Kate herself cannot respond. The Reverend sees Kate's body undressed, and lusts for her, but she has not provoked it; she does not even know he is looking at her. The Reverend never describes Kate's body as beautiful but as a spiritual diversion, as God in the body of a woman. In Hartman's case, Kate's body clearly teaches without her knowledge.

With George, Kate is conscious of what she does with her body. But with the Reverend Hartman, Kate's body is a kind of blank page upon which the Reverend writes his own text. This is one way that mature learning can take place. Kate's body leads the Reverend Hartman out of spiritual despair. He creates his own truth from the sight of her body, which is sending a message despite her complete unawareness. This is the result Frank hopes for, that by the prompt of Eros the student can learn what he or she wants. The Reverend learns what Kate knows--that sexual desire and intellectual desire often come together. He also learns to acknowledge that the truth may set him free, even if that truth is something he considers sinful. Kate's nude body first incites lust but then leads the Reverend to pray. The same thing happens with George; lust is followed by a yearning for truth.

The Reverend becomes more confident in himself after seeing Kate through her window. He is more aware of temptation and his sermons are more charismatic. Even though his lust increases, he is happy to find that the Lord delivers him from temptation every time, for example, by sending Aunt Swift to the window instead of Kate. The Reverend is shocked by Kate's smoking but reminds himself that she has lived an adventurous life, having spent time in Europe and New York City. This is one way that he begins to have more compassion for human imperfection. His own imperfection,

that of lust for a woman, is manifested by the tiny hole he makes in his window and is symbolized by the spot that is cracked away, the heel of the boy looking into the face of Christ--a pagan symbol but an apt one--the Reverend's Achilles' heel. He prays: "Please, Father, do not forget me. Give me power to go tomorrow and repair the hole in the window" (152). When God does not move him to do so he decides that God must be testing him with the temptation. As he continues to contemplate the test, he decides that he deserves to know passion and that he will not be a hypocrite. He considers leaving the ministry and seeking women:

> Man . . . has no right to forget that he is an animal . . . I will besiege this school teacher. . . if I am a creature of carnal lusts I will live then for my lusts . . . I will see this woman and will think the thoughts I have never dared to think. (154)

This time when the Reverend goes to wait and watch for Kate, she appears naked and weeping, and kneels down to pray, looking like "the figure of the boy in the presence of the Christ on the leaded window" (155). The Reverend smashes the whole window with his fist and runs into the street. He goes to George Willard to tell of his message from God brought to him in the body of a woman:

> God has appeared to me in the person of Kate Swift, the school teacher, kneeling naked on a bed. Do you know

> Kate Swift? Although she may not be aware of it, she is an instrument of God, bearing the message of truth. (155)

Now the Reverend knows that even the naked and carnal pray; that he can lust and still serve God. He has also learned not to try to patch up a hole but to replace the entire spectacle. He credits God through the body of Kate for his insight, but in reality he has learned this truth by and for himself.

To look at the teacher's body is one way that the desire to learn becomes something physical. The Reverend's voyeuristic act is not unlike that of a student. The student, or the observer, processes many ideas and thinks through many fantasies of which the teacher is unaware. Like it or not, the teacher is the student's fantasy. The teacher is a vulnerable object, moving, breathing, speaking for the class before her; his or her body an object upon which students will write their story of a night, a semester, a lifetime. A strong and generous person should take this position, with an awareness of the power to not only manipulate and suggest, but also the humility of being formed and designed--of being part of the student's learning material. This projection onto the teacher of so many years of developing thoughts and questions often makes the teacher become an object of the student's desire. Students can learn on their own, but learning through the body of another,

through intimacy with another, is much more pleasurable and is more likely to be membered many times over.

Some teachers respond with anxiety to such a situation, while others may take it seriously, use it as an ego boost, deny it and laugh it off, or redirect the student's desire toward the course material. Very often, as the student extracts meaning from the teacher's body, the love and desire felt for the teacher are really a love for one's own broadening view of life and the overwhelming joy of self-discovery. This aspect of the pedagogical relationship can be one of the most cherished and deeply profound events people ever experience. On the other hand, people who lack respect and admiration for each other or for sex, will take advantage of pedagogical energy and enter thoughtless relationships. Some of these relationships prove to be solid and everlasting. There are many, however, that do not and it is the teacher's responsibility to assess the student's maturity and vulnerability, and to divert the student's desire with what the thoughtful teacher perceives to be the student's need.

Anderson does not place Kate on a pedestal because she is a woman but because she is a teacher. (So was Anderson's mother.) Her seductiveness is a manifestation of her ability to educe--to lead people out of their delusions toward an understanding of their real lives. But a teacher must be able to know when a student is

ready for such learning. Wing, also, dreams that he is on a pedestal toward which young men come to sit and learn. Wing is afraid of that dream. Kate embodies it, and suffers perhaps as much as Wing because she never learns of the stories she brings out in people, the places to which she leads. Her seduction arouses, empowers, and ennobles others, but humiliates Kate: "Do you know Kate Swift?" (155). Do you? She is the teacher who makes herself available at her own risk:

> During the afternoon the school teacher had been to see Doctor Welling concerning her health. The doctor had scolded her and had declared she was in danger of losing her hearing. It was foolish for Kate Swift to be abroad in the storm, foolish and perhaps dangerous. The woman in the streets did not remember the words of the doctor and would not have turned back had she remembered. (164)

She was walking through the storm intending to have another talk with George Willard.

"Except You enthrall me"

Of course most of us had done our reading. But in Intro to Lit, we read without any strain, and, consequently, without any understanding. As we stared dully into our books, Dr. Fordula wondered with frustration at our lack of insight or even interest in what John Donne was pleading for.

When no one volunteered to utter any impression whatsoever, Dr. Fordula tried asking questions. "Who is this poem addressed to?" We shifted uncomfortably in our seats. Someone had the wits to whisper a single, uncertain syllable. It was all she had, so Dr. Fordula pounced on it: "Yes! God!"

We all exhaled a sigh of relief, assuming things had gone far enough, and that we would now be given something to write down or a new page number to turn to. But the teacher wasn't through with us yet. "What is the poet, the speaker, asking God?" We cringed and shifted again; I looked around wondering where the Christians were. They should say something. "He needs to be saved?" one asked. Finally! Now we can go on.

But the teacher merely looked at us. Then she put down

her book, stretched out her slim, silky, bare arms (it was summer), let her head fall to one side, and her hands go limp. It was at this point that I noticed she wasn't wearing a bra. Others must have noticed, too, because many became suddenly quite attentive.

Her voice became louder and she maintained the crucified (braless) position, offering it to us. She spoke each word separately, with great conviction. "He is saying, 'I'm not willing . . . so rape me'." We stared, dumbstruck and still, and then suddenly there was a massive rustling of paper as we all looked back at the poem: "he said *that*? We must have missed something."

Dr. Fordula relaxed her body and said something like, "Let's try this again on Monday." I don't know exactly what she said, because I was busy reading.

CHAPTER 5

THE STUDENT BODY: MISSING SOMETHING

Anderson does not offer a hopeful end to the journey for knowledge. Actually, he does not offer an end at all. George does not leave Winesburg with an understanding of death or life or love, only with some money and a comfortable seat. Something is still missing in his life. If anything, he has learned where not to look. Characters in *Winesburg, Ohio* who turn to words or bodies are following the misleading lure of wisdom. Neither the written word nor the material body can confer wisdom no matter how forcefully manifested. The end of the anguish and disillusionment in *Winesburg, Ohio* is the beginning of George's search for meaning. From the old writer with "many notions in his head" (22) to the young man wanting to be sure not to "appear green," a series of odd but provocative encounters chronicles the thwarted hopes and missed epiphanies that are, finally, merely "background." And while "one looking at him would not have thought him particularly sharp" (247), George has begun to understand life. He understands that there is not all that much to it.

While many characters pound and swing at each other due to a lack of words, the characters who deliberately seek book knowledge are perhaps more helpless; their lives are tragic. George gets a second chance (the Bentleys are not so lucky) after he tries to use a human being, Helen, as material for his craft. Even after Kate has urged him to live life before he tries to write about it, George is still confused; "lust and night and women" obscure his vision. George knows there is something missing in what people say, even in what he says himself. More than once he almost accepts sex as a substitute for understanding. But those seeking wisdom through sexual communion also come up empty-handed. Anderson provides no image of George's sexual initiation with Louise Trunnion, and George himself has little to say about it, only--"nobody knows."

Reading *Winesburg, Ohio* as a *bildungsroman* leaves critics battling and baffled, for George's story is one of continuous deferral and readers sometimes complain that "nothing happens." This impression is partially explained by Edwin Fussell, who says that Anderson refuses to "sentimentalize the figure of the writer." Instead of presenting George's story, Anderson calls upon a parade of characters who each tell their stories to George, rendering the story more of a "pageant" than a portrait of the artist (110). Pickering claims that *Winesburg, Ohio* ends "on a despairing note"

and is a story parallel to the life of Anderson in which the "threat" of lust and the inability to communicate combine to create the somber conclusion of a hopeless romantic who "faces backward rather than forward" (28) and who will spend his days repeating the same stories like the Ancient Mariner. Fussell contends that such isolation is the inevitable conclusion of a *bildungsroman*, and that one must come to an acceptance of isolation.

Many of the characters in Winesburg are not only isolated but hiding, or living outside the city--"Tom Foster came to Winesburg from Cincinnati" (210) with a secret in his family's past. Doctor Parcival came from Chicago and before that lived in "a town in Iowa--or was it in Illinois?" (51), hoping to hide his identity but still wanting to use his past to get attention from George. Enoch Robinson lived "east of Winesburg and two miles beyond the town limits" (167) after having been away in New York for fifteen years. The Bentley family came from New York State to buy farmland at a low price; "in the spring and through most of the winter the highways leading into the town of Winesburg were a sea of mud" (64). Many of the most pathetic incidents of miscommunication involve people on the fringes of the community.

Jesse Bentley was a religious fanatic who went "to school to become a scholar and eventually to become a minister of the Presbyterian Church" (66). He came to the isolated farm when his

brothers had been killed in the war and there was no one else to help with the work. He was more suited to formal education than farming because he was slight, "womanish of body," and rather odd. Jesse and his son-in-law eventually became very successful financially, but they caused harm to others along their way. The farm work was difficult and Jesse Bentley worked his wife so hard that after about a year of marriage she gave birth to a baby and died. Jesse had not intended to be unkind to his wife but he was too absorbed with himself. He felt he was destined by God for something great, and the land gave him a feeling of being an Old Testament servant of God. After all his schooling, he saw himself set apart from the other men, seeing in them no special mission. He cried out to God for a son, but instead he got Louise.

Louise was also very much a scholar, and fate was not kind to her, either. She went to town to live with the Hardy family so that she could go to school. Mr. Hardy was very enthusiastic about education: "he had made his own way in the world without learning got from books, but he was convinced that had he but known books things would have gone better with him" (88). Louise was constantly studying, and eager "to answer every question put to the class by the teacher" (89). She earned only the hatred of the Hardy sisters--"I hate books and I hate anyone who likes books" (88) one of the girls declared--and a life locked in a loveless marriage. The

marriage was the result of a love note she had written when she didn't know what love was. Her words were not understood. Her plea for love meant sex to John Hardy. After all her efforts toward finding happiness--leaving her father to apply herself to study and then asking outright for love when books made her an outcast--she finds herself in a physical relationship that she does not want. Louise wanted to talk with someone who would listen with tenderness. She "tried to make her husband understand the vague and intangible hunger that had led to the writing of the note" (96) but she was never successful at communicating with either her body or her words.

Kate Swift is the only character in *Winesburg, Ohio* who seems to have any insight into the problem of words or sex. She picks out George to talk to because she sees in him the potential for understanding. Unlike Wing, whose own fear strikes panic in the boy, Kate is a bold and daring woman and she pushes George toward real knowledge. Kate is not afraid of her passion and can pass it on to George as he straddles the threshold of boyhood and manhood. Wing tells George to "shut your ears to the roaring of voices" (30) and immediately recoils in horror. In Anderson's *Memoirs* he relates: "they are all talking. There is a roar of voices. Of what do they all speak? Of sex" (White 386).

Kate, on the other hand, offers George books, but strongly

advises him that there are other places to look for meaning: "'You must not become a mere peddler of words. The thing to learn is to know what people are thinking about, not what they say'" (163). Though the townspeople view George as wise and capable he is really still a student of life. The ability to know what people are thinking is not yet developed in George, and he is instead overcome by what people are saying: "What makes you keep saying such things? Now you quit it, do you hear?" (219). At other times he commands, "Don't stop now. Tell me the rest of it . . . Tell me the rest of the story" (177).

George hears secrets, and tales of love and hate. He is besieged by people who have lost hold of their dreams; Enoch Robinson had hoped to be an artist "but that never turned out." Joe Welling feels he was "meant by Nature to be a reporter on a newspaper," and comes to George with ideas:

> You carry a little pad of paper in your pocket, don't you? I knew you did. Well, you set this down. I thought of it the other day. Let's take decay. Now what is decay? It's fire . . .You never thought of that? Of course not . . . the world is on fire. Start your pieces in the paper that way. Just say in big letters 'The World Is On Fire.' (106)

The townspeople believe that if they cannot say what they mean then George should be able to say it for them. He is a writer;

he should have the answers. What else could he be thinking, and why does he carry around the little notepad? It must be full of answers. Exactly the opposite, like Anderson, George writes only the questions. Anderson grieved over the fact that words are lies that prevent people from becoming truly intimate with each other. In Chicago he met many types of people and longed to understand what made people behave the way they did. He was a favorite among prostitutes because he listened to their life stories. He was touched and amazed by what he saw people willing to do in their attempts to fill their void.

George feels something similar, but does not know what to make of it. When George leaves Winesburg, "to meet the adventure of life," he begins to think, "but he did not think of anything very big or dramatic" (246). When he arrives at the depot, more than a dozen people are standing on the platform to send him off, but they did not know what to say, only, "Good luck," from a woman who had never paid much attention to him before. His departure in no way resembles a heroic ending, just as his life has been rather uneventful. He lives through others, most of whom are failures.

Thurston and Stouck see *Winesburg, Ohio* as an incomplete or tragic initiation because George, as well as the characters for whom he speaks, remains stuck in adolescence. Fussell, however, maintains that this is exactly the paradox of growing up. The

characters who continue to cry and demand understanding never grow up. Maturity comes to those who recognize the meaninglessness of life and who realize that "love is essentially the shared acceptance by two people . . . of their final separateness" (114). This is what George almost learns from Kate and Helen; he is missing the realization of his own essence which will always be isolated and individual. For this reason, the afternoon of "lustful thoughts" about these women seems to me to be one of the most significant scenes throughout the entire collection of stories. George's autoeroticism is more than a simple outlet; it is a significant statement of self. No matter how lonesome it seems, it is undeniably an individual moment of truth.

The townspeople, whether they come to George with words or hands, fail because they want answers and understanding from outside themselves. Wisdom appears to be available through a book or a body, but investing one's totality into these external attractions leaves one devoid of identity. As readers learn in "The Book of the Grotesque," another's truth is a twisted figure in a procession of falsehoods. The reader learns of the odd and drastic thoughts of the grotesques through George, though very little that he hears makes sense to him. And what does George say for himself? "Death," he mutters on one soul-searching night. He is overcome with desire to say "words without meaning, rolling them

over on his tongue and saying them because they were brave words . . . night, the sea, fear, loveliness" (185). On this moody night he decides he would feel better if he could be with a woman.

Readers learn the most about George Willard when he is with a woman. George has sex with Louise Trunnion, and he gets some kissing and squeezing from Belle Carpenter; in fact, things are looking promising until Belle's lover shows up. But it is Kate and Helen with whom George has the most intimacy. His mother is far too idealized and pitiable for George to make meaning of life with her. Both of George's parents, as well as most of the characters in Winesburg, hope to live through George. Kate and Helen have strong and individual personalities that they want to share with George and readers learn much from these encounters.

George, like Anderson, values "the gentle character" of women. Anderson felt that during the time of the American industrial revolution, women kept their sense of self while men did not, because men could be so easily replaced with machines. All the men in *Winesburg, Ohio* are grappling with that problem, and many of them turn to women for the sense that they are still needed. George turns to several women, trying to learn to feel like a man when all the men around him are themselves confused about their function and can give him little advice. After George had sex with Louise Trunnion, he "wanted more than anything else to talk

to some man" (61). But in the community of Winesburg, where both touch and talk are frequently misunderstood, it is not until George's former teacher tries to reach him that George begins to understand that what he was searching for was more than the masculine dominance of sex and could never be revealed by words.

At first George misunderstands Kate's passion. He has been looking for words, asking others, listening to people's needs, and muttering to himself. Kate asks George for nothing. She is simply willing and eager to teach. From all of Kate's attention, George "began to believe she might be in love with him and the thought was both pleasing and annoying" (158). He sits outside in the evening next to a fire he had built, thinking about Kate Swift and wondering what she meant by all her talks with him. His thoughts provoke an adolescent nervousness in that he looks around to make sure no one is watching him and then pretends to talk to Kate. They had had many talks, in his office, at her home, and on a "grassy bank" at the fairground. Kate had spoken to him earnestly, touching him and looking into his eyes. George listened and continued to visit with her, borrowing books despite his confusion concerning the teacher's "eagerness to open the door of life" to him (164). This confusion leads him to have "lustful thoughts" about his teacher:

> pulling down the shade of the window [he] closed his

> eyes and turned his face to the wall. He took a pillow into his arms and embraced it thinking first of the school teacher, who by her words had stirred something within him, and later of Helen White, the slim daughter of the town banker, with whom he had been for a long time half in love. (158)

Though few scholars have lingered over this passage it is one time when the reader really sees George Willard in his personal life. Most of the time his character is simply there for the input of others. Even George's first sexual experience reveals little about his feelings, emotional or physical; the reader is allowed no knowledge as to what happened or how George felt about it. Considering the number of essays on sexuality or loneliness in the study of *Winesburg, Ohio,* I find this omission incredible. Anderson is fairly direct in telling the reader that George is fantasizing about his former English teacher and his vaguely recognized love object and masturbating.[27] One other scholar, Ray Lewis White, proposes this reading and points out that George thinks "first of Kate (a forbidden subject) and then of Helen White, daughter of a local banker (a safe subject)" (*Exploration* 47). One may assume that Kate is a forbidden subject because she was once George's teacher, and because she is older than he, whereas Helen is a young student herself. The afternoon of "lustful thoughts" and the two

passionate scenes with Kate Swift are the only sources of intimate knowledge about George.

The taboo of sexual relationships between students and teachers is so strong that even a former teacher is considered "forbidden." Yet it is clear that Kate has had an enormous impact on George, intellectually and sexually. It is her intellectual eagerness that stimulates her passion for George, though she, too, feels she must fight it, just as Wing felt he had to keep his hands in his pockets. Both teachers see their hands as a marked barrier between them and their students. Kate has kissed George on the cheek, and has acknowledged that she wants to do it again. But when they fully embrace, Kate breaks their bond with her hands. George:

> held the body of the woman tightly against his body and then it stiffened. Two sharp little fists began to beat on his face. When the school teacher had run away and left him alone, he walked up and down the office swearing furiously. (165)

Later that night "George Willard rolled about in the bed on which he had lain in the afternoon hugging the pillow and thinking thoughts of Kate Swift . . . he tried to understand what had happened" (165-66). He is awake for hours, thinking, and when he finally becomes drowsy he "raised a hand and with it groped about in the darkness"

(166). It is at this point that George realizes his encounter and talk with Kate meant more than he could understand, that he has "missed something" that cannot be transmitted through books or through the body.

It seems that George misses just about everything he is told. When George first decides to become a writer he believes he can live life artificially and develop his craft. He tells Seth Richmond that he is trying to write a love story and needs to fall in love. He has thought it over and decided that that is the best thing to do and he has even chosen the ideal maiden, Helen White, "she is the only girl in town with any 'get-up' to her." Seth is sent as George's messenger: "see how she takes it, and then you come and tell me" (135). Helen makes no response to this, and the matter is dropped for a while, until Tom Foster gets drunk and tells George that he has made love to Helen on the shore of some sea. George remembers his old feeling toward Helen and angrily asks Tom to explain himself--surely Tom is out of his mind with drink. Again George listens with compassion, even though he is angry that Tom has told sexual lies about Helen, and even though he doesn't understand why, "he felt drawn toward the pale, shaken boy as he had never before been drawn toward anyone" (218). George shares with Tom a passion to know life and truth that is so great that Tom is willing to lie about someone lovely. Tom Foster is one of the

few characters in the story who touches George gently; he puts forth his hand and rests it on George's arm as he tries to explain. Tom wants to know youthful passion and he wants to "learn things." Whether it was the drunkenness or the lying, Tom tries hard to say why he "did it"--"It taught me something, that's it, that's what I wanted. Don't you understand? I wanted to learn things, you see. That's why I did it" (219).

This confession is the essence of the desire to know, to find the truth even if it means lying. The characters in Winesburg want to know and they want to be known. As George grows older, he recognizes the same passion stirring within himself. He feels old and tired, and he feels the weight of developing knowledge. He wants to share his knowledge with someone--"he wants, most of all, understanding" (235). He decides he wants to share his new sophistication and manhood with Helen White. The point at which George feels himself maturing may also be the point at which he becomes more of a teacher and less of a student. He has learned lessons and philosophies from the citizens of Winesburg. He has, in the past, told Helen of his great thoughts and that he is going to be an important man. George has given Helen advice, but now the "sadness of sophistication" is upon him and he realizes his old dreams were foolish talk. He feels lonely and "with all his heart he wants to come close to some other human, touch someone with

his hands, be touched by the hand of another" (235).

Touching another with his hands may ease George's loneliness but it is not an avenue of truth. It would not be a step toward maturity. The characters in Winesburg do not touch to transmit knowledge, some of them even make knowledge inaccessible through their desperate and unshackled touching. Accepting one's self and one's own truth is ultimately a lonely experience. When Anderson presents George in his bedroom with the shades drawn, the reader sees a rare moment in *Winesburg, Ohio.* Here one sees an individual alone, not seen by any other character in the book. George's eyes are closed and he reaches for himself and the pillow. This picture is true, simple, and solitary, much like the final scene when George closes his eyes and leans back in his seat on the train. It is symbolized by shutting his eyes, not his ears as Wing had advised, that George finds a maturing moment of solitude.

A teacher's body is a stimulant, but it is not the truth. The students seeking knowledge throughout Anderson's *Winesburg, Ohio*--Louise Bentley, George Willard, Helen White--all stumble along the way, sometimes during their encounters with teachers, because they are looking for someone who can simply give them knowledge and emancipation. The teachers in the stories--Wing Biddlebaum, Kate Swift, and the unnamed professor from Cleveland--all represent different methods of teaching. Wing

helplessly hopes to transmit what he knows through touch; Kate decides when she should use her body and to what extent; Helen's professor has not a name, much less a body. Helen knows instinctively that "he would not do for her purpose" (235) which is to step into womanhood. There are several characters who think highly of school and scholarship and these characters are often the catalyst for someone else's despair. Jesse Bentley uttered Louise into a quickness of misery. She was not wanted, and destined to be bitter and sorrowful when her father cried out to God for a son. She is, in turn, cruel to her own son and the boy's maternal grandfather causes him to run away and never return.

Anderson had little patience for intellectuals and used even minor characters such as Helen White's college instructor to demonstrate his disdain for those who believed they could become more sophisticated than others by scholarship. Helen has grown tired of empty talk. She is impatient with the pedantic professor her mother invited from the college. She is pleased by the attention that being escorted by a well-dressed stranger brings. But she is "thinking of George Willard even as he wandered gloomily through the crowds thinking of her" (236). The dispassionate instructor made Helen feel "restless and distraught." The man "wanted to appear cosmopolitan" and his pomposity was dull and meaningless to Helen. From the front porch Helen went

inside and to the back door and stood trembling, "it seemed to her that the world was full of meaningless people saying words" (239). Suffocated by the intellectual teacher she runs outside, calling for George. Meeting in the dark, they walk together mostly in silence and with a mutual respect for each other's maturity. George is refreshed by Helen's presence; "it was as though her woman's hand was assisting him to make some minute readjustment of the machinery of his life" (241).

Here Anderson returns to the theme of human touch supplanted by the machine and the romance between Helen and George is demonstrated with hands. Helen and George use gesture to express that which words would diminish. In many cases it is necessary to get away from words to find the truth. The touch and silence, though sometimes terrifying or painful, is the only honest speech. Anderson denies the sexual in the last scene between Helen and George, preferring instead this thought:

> I didn't just want to touch you . . . I wanted to stay near you. Tonight I would have liked sitting by you in silence--just letting something go and come between us. There are no words for it. (Modlin 115)

Most of the stories dealing with sexuality are somewhat tragic and most are limited to the use of hands. In reality there is no word and no touch that can salvage humanity.[28] People can reach

out, toward others, toward nothing; hands may light briefly on a pillow, a rosary, a berry, a ticket, but true union with another is impossible. This is shown in many of the relationships in *Winesburg, Ohio* but it is in the relationships between the teachers and students that this oneliness is most observed and, for brief moments, understood. With the help of a wise and experienced teacher George learns that the search for truth is a singular search; Helen senses this from George and walks "beside him filled with respect." The balance between leading and learning is a delicate one, as the narrator explains: George's "feeling of loneliness and isolation . . . was both broken and intensified by the presence of Helen" (240). The pursuit of insight is a lonely one. Though "Sophistication" ties many things together, it can hardly be seen as a happy conclusion. George and Helen are pensive together, yet separate. There is no suggestion that marriage will occur, only that for a few moments the couple became "excited little animals." George reflects on his insignificance. The community fair has ended, leaving the eerie silence of the ghosts of living people.

The desire to learn is a lonely and usually dangerous prospect in Anderson's view. Sometimes in spite of many good intentions the message is lost, the epiphany skipping like a flat rock on water. But the process, with both the mistakes and the pleasures, gives one the experience needed to recognize wisdom and maturity when

one finds it. Students and teachers in *Winesburg, Ohio* have more successful relationships when the body is involved. But, in Wing's case, the touch proved dangerous also. The body is not what Louise wanted, but her written words communicated a message she did not understand herself. Louise would have been well-advised to live life before she wrote about it. The isolation in Winesburg reflects much of Anderson's doubt about words, which is why he presents most of the characters only through gnarled recollections of their experience, second-hand at that. Experience in Winesburg is filtered through George, then the narrator; finally the reader is left alone with the text.

The anticlimactic "Departure" demonstrates once more that George is alone. He walks in the quiet morning darkness into town, just another of the thousands of young men who have left their small hometowns for a big city. When he is sure no one is looking he counts his money. When the train comes into the station, George hurries on board and "Helen White came running along Main Street hoping to have a parting word with him, but he had found a seat and did not see her" (246). In an initiation story there is usually something missing at the point of expected insight. In *Winesburg, Ohio* the parting word is missing, and soon after, so is the little town.

Social Studies

My second grade teacher had just explained the concept of a community and its laws. Mrs. Gertrude Lewis gave the class an assignment in our social studies workbook, which we all dutifully began to complete. Well, most of us.

Of course I was busy opening my workbook to the assigned page and getting out my pencil. But Leonard, the boy who sat in front of me, turned around and said to me: "Do you want to play tic-tac-toe?" This was too much to resist. I agreed enthusiastically, forgetting about the laws of a community. We happily marked Leonard's shoddy sheet of paper with Xs and Os, playing game after game. I almost always won.

Soon Mrs. Lewis noticed our commotion and sneaked right up to us to ask thunderously: "What are you two doing?" I froze with panic. I had never been in trouble at school before, well, except for the time in kindergarten when the teacher picked me to return papers (because I was such a good student) and I found that I could make everyone laugh by throwing their papers to them rather than sedately placing

them on their desks.

I couldn't answer Mrs. Lewis. I was frozen with fear. So finally Leonard mumbled sheepishly, "playing tic-tac-toe." "Go out into the hall," Mrs. Lewis said. The class snickered, because they all knew what going into the hall meant. Hot shame and terror flowed through my body and I could barely move. I had never been paddled before. In a nightmare trance I walked into the hall with Leonard and Mrs. Lewis. Mrs. Lewis took the board to Leonard first while I stared in horror. As a boy, he was rather used to being in trouble, and with only mild embarrassment he took his beating and went back into the room to do his work. Then Mrs. Lewis turned to me.

"Belinda, I'm not going to paddle you, because Leonard was the one turned around in his seat. And because you at least had your book open."

I got through the rest of my 30 or so school years with that motto imprinted forever in my mind. Never turn away from the teacher, and ALWAYS keep your book open.

Thank you, Mrs. Lewis.

CHAPTER 6

THE BODY OF THE TEXT: DISMEMBERING DESIRE

"Education" is closely related to the word "seduction." An infant is seduced into focusing its energy on the parent's face and is driven to return to the place where it felt whole--to *re member* the harmony and rhythm of its origin. This type of seduction must continue into the pedagogical relationship because this is the way human beings learn. A student who is not seduced by the objectification of the teacher's body (or who resists, by staring at the ceiling or falling asleep in class, for example) may never learn or care for the subject matter. However, there is also the phenomenon of the text which engages many students. In the exchange between student and teacher there is a third object present and that is the textbook or student paper. People who share a piece of literature sit closer to each other, close enough to hear or feel the other breathing, to smell each other, and they both may touch or write on the text. There are many discussions of the function of Eros in the classroom from the teacher's perspective. I would like to devote as much investigation and energy to classroom sexuality from the student's seat.

When the esteemed members of our profession say "teaching was just like sex for me" (Jane Tompkins); "graduate students are my sexual preference" (Jane Gallop); or when Wexelblatt explains the "penetrations of professing by Eros" and the "professorial equivalent of the orgasm" (12-13), one ought to wonder what the student is feeling or thinking. John Glavin believes they are thinking something along the lines of a Donne sonnet: "Take me . . . please me, entertain me, divert me, fascinate me, thrill me, seduce!" (12).

Actually, at the time of the learning experience, they are probably thinking about Sting lyrics; Regina Barreca concurs, and though she refers only to "Don't Stand So Close to Me" and not my personal favorite obsessive crush Sting song "Every Breath You Take," we do agree that there is most likely clear relevance to the fact that Sting was once an English teacher.[29] In retrospect, Barreca remembers it this way:

> I grew up falling . . . in love with every English teacher I had from junior high onward . . . I would bet that many . . . who enter our profession have fallen in love with their teachers over the years. Sometimes we sublimate effectively . . . often we translate our desire into a love of the subject, or the text, or the way the light hits a four o'clock window in a November classroom. (1)

In my research I found many texts devoted to the erotic element in the classroom, but most of these works were from the teacher's point of view. Most often, the teacher sees two options available. One is to give in to the student's adoration and become sexually intimate with the student and the other is to redirect the student's affection toward interest in the subject. I have been fortunate enough to have encountered teachers with much more humane and creative responses to this situation. It is true, however, that an element of desire shapes a student's career plan, course choices, and development as a professional. Students tend to work harder for a teacher they love, in an effort to elicit an affectionate or admiring response. Alison Jones admits to having "sexual fantasies" about her instructors and that these feelings influenced her course choices: "if some teacher was lively and 'turned me on' to a subject I would be likely to take it" (102). Eroticism in the classroom, once meaning only male imposition of power over female students, is now seriously discussed as a teaching tool. Some take it more seriously than others.

Both hooks and Gallop laugh (suspiciously loudly) at their younger days of seducing professors and feeling eroticized by power and not the teacher, who was likely to be one of those "smart nerdy guys who didn't get sex in high school . . . who were suddenly seen as sexy by adoring students" (hooks "Passionate" 48-

49). These teachers and scholars report being empowered by sleeping with their professors, understanding sex with their teachers as a conquest that made them equals. This type of empowerment strikes me as being simply another form of putting women in their place--the bedroom. Why are hooks and Gallop so pleased with what seems to be more of a regression for women in college or the work place? They are still sleeping with men in order to feel empowered. Why could they not be empowered in another way?

Further, I take offense to Gallop's "SBFJ" story, related in *Feminist Accused of Sexual Harassment*, in which two female students who spent much time with Gallop in what she refers to as an "atmosphere thickened with unspoken fantasies of transgressive possibility," one night

> giddily confided that every time they passed my apartment building they would jokingly suggest "SBFJ." After making me beg repeatedly for explication, one of them finally whispered that the joke's abbreviation stood for "Stop By, Fuck Jane." (46)

Gallop eventually slept with both of these women (separately). Why does this story offend me? I have considered that for quite some time. It is not that I disapprove of students and teachers having sexual relationships with each other. It is not even that the

teacher and students are regarding desire so flippantly. It is that this does not seem to be an instance of intellectual excitement becoming sexual excitement. It might seem different if the apartment- dweller were not a teacher, but rather a friend who was particularly welcoming when people stopped by. It would also seem different if the students were going to their teacher's apartment to discuss a book and then they ended up in bed together. This story simply reveals a different form of sexual harassment to which an adored teacher should never be submitted. Pure lust is important, but I prefer erotic energy myself.

The overall point that hooks and Gallop make, however, is a necessary and important distinction. There is a great deal of difference in sex as power play in the classroom (whether initiated by the student or the teacher) and sex as a sincere response to a variety of powerful feelings the intimacies of a literature classroom invoke. Further, Gallop and hooks insist that feminism has come far enough that women can make sexual choices and do not need the sex police to make sure they are not victimized. Jones provides an excellent survey of frameworks for desire in the classroom but ultimately offers the same conclusion as hooks and Gallop, that women are "harassable" only in a certain context, a patriarchal context that can be diminished by open discussion of eroticism in the classroom as a positive force rather than a

victimizing force owned as a matter of fact by the male professor.

These few contributions to the students' experience with eroticism in the classroom are always filtered through theory and argument. Even Barreca, after all her nostalgic reminiscence, says ultimately we must leave "behind the idea of love in order to embrace the love of an idea" (10). She allows the reader only a bit of romantic memory before her jolting question: "at what point, I would like to ask, did the moment come for each of us when we realized that we wanted to be the teacher, and not sleep with the teacher?" (2). Wait a minute--I protest--what about the Sting songs? This girl's an open page, remember? There are many possible answers to this question; the thread that connects them all seems to be the understanding that if one is to *re*member something, one must first *dis*member it. Whether through theory or through writing one's own text, both student and teacher must realize that though leading and learning are intensely intimate, it is ultimately an individual, self- actualizing experience. Theoretically, "the student is falling not so much for the teacher as for the idealized vision of self that the teacher seems to make possible, seems to bring . . . into being" (Glavin 16). At the other end of the spectrum, one is found raped by logic; wanting eloquence: "de do do do, de da da da" but finding no words or theories that will express the truth. And for Alice Hindman, the

only option is to try to force one's self to "face bravely the fact that many people must live and die alone, even in Winesburg" (120). People grow, age, and die and though texts are also mutable they are constant in that they will forever bring teachers and learners together, bring one closer to one's self, and, like a third wheel, often push people apart.

The text that is an assignment is a means of mental intimacy with the teacher or some other person. As a student reads the assignment he or she may be conscious of the fact that the teacher is reading, or has read, the same text. This is different from simple displacement of feelings of love. There is a real intimacy with a book that can elicit feelings as strong as those provoked by the teacher. Kellman observes that in addition to the many analogies between writing and the body there is a literal connection: "books and bodies are both commonly taken to bed" (16).[30] The student in love may imagine that the teacher is taking the same book to bed or at least, that the student's mind and the teacher's mind are dwelling on the same subject.

Wexelblatt relates the story of a colleague who had a disappointingly unresponsive group in his introductory physics course. One day the students arrived, perplexed to find that the seats were in a large circle and that right in the middle of the circle was a desk with the heavy, ponderous physics text propped

upright upon it. The professor explained:

> 'This is your textbook. Possibly some of you may recognize it . . . For the next fifty minutes you can say whatever you like to this book.' The students giggled . . . and then fell silent . . . Eventually a young woman raised her hand uncertainly. The professor . . . pointed at the book. The student lowered her eyes and looked with genuine resentment at the fat, double-columned text. 'I hate you,' she said evenly and not without courage. (17-18)

The text can be a stand-in for the teacher. In addition to providing mental intimacy, the text is a place where otherwise restrained love, anger, desire may be released. Students have been trained in this kind of responsiveness because that is all that is allowed. The teacher may be distant but the text is always fair game. Once a student learns to keep his or her mouth shut, to be still, he or she is rewarded with a picture to look at or mark upon, a workbook or textbook to touch and upon which to fix the gaze:

> we have displaced school bodies with school texts. I do not ask my students, 'do you understand me?' Instead I ask them to understand my reading of the text. We pass texts between us. We touch the text instead of each other and make our marks on it rather than on each

other. (Grumet 144)

Educators like texts. They are tidy and efficient. They keep students looking busy. But because the reader of the text is not fixed, "meaning is continually deferred" (149). When texts preempt the body, misreadings occur. This is what Anderson insists on reinforcing, that when bodies erupt in an unapproved place, confusion ensues. Students and teachers accept texts as substitutes for bodies but there is always something missing. To be a text is to be not a human being. There are always only bits and scraps, like Doc Reefy's paper pills. The text is here to cure us when we cannot put our finger on the real experience and all that it means or when we are not allowed to explore the human elements of the learning experience. Yet the text is something, and when shared, brings people closer to understanding and insight and to each other. Of course misreadings, of either text or body, can complicate or even destroy the relationship. There is a risk involved in any gesture from one person to another. In Doc Reefy's case, the risk is never taken, the text is never shared; it remains crumpled in Doc's pocket.

As for Louise Bentley, her entire life is based on a misunderstood text: "'I want someone to love me and I want to love someone,' she wrote" (94). What could she have said that would have made any more sense? She did not understand the feeling

herself, and as Anderson writes again of his own failure to capture true human intent in writing:

> Before such women as Louise can be understood and their lives made livable, much will have to be done. Thoughtful books will have to be written and thoughtful lives lived by people about them. (87)

Some of the most thoughtful texts written are papers and notes exchanged between students and teachers, as well as the texts assigned by the teacher to be read for class. George may be referring to such texts when he says to Helen, "I've been reading books and I've been thinking." This is the slightly more mature version of Louise Bentley's plea, and is the heart of Anderson's thesis. People want and need to make intimate connections with others and they will in any way possible.

In the realistic practice of teaching writing or literature, that intimacy is felt through the writing, reading, and marking that passes between a student and a teacher. It is also made manifest when people draw close together to look at a text, perhaps even touching it, letting the text channel the desire or the nurturance. When a student turns in a paper, especially for a subject or teacher in which the student has invested much emotion, her or his anticipation of the return of the paper swells with energy similar to sexual anticipation. When the student is in love with the

teacher, the waiting is almost unbearable. For in this case, the marks the teacher makes on the paper are, to the student, erotic messages, answers to agonizing questions. Does the teacher like me? Does the teacher admire my ideas or my writing? These are highly charged questions for the student in love. The student has sent her or his beliefs and desires out to the teacher and hopes for confirmation or even flattery in return. Of course, I am speaking of the serious student who *has* beliefs and desires, and an English class, especially one that is not required, is the room most likely to contain such a student. Gurko believes that the classroom is a sexual place in that it is full of anticipation, new experiences and epiphanies. She tries to stimulate the students and coax their energy and intellect to the highest level possible. This form of seduction "*ought* to be there; without it, nothing is happening . . . intellectual excitement can lead very naturally to sexual excitement, and the two kinds of sharing become intertwined" (26).

I never knew this was possible until I entered college. My first college literature teacher was a clinically depressed Modernist. While all my depressed life everyone had been telling me to "snap out of it" or something to that effect, this man was professing tangible reasons to be depressed. Not only reasons, but beautiful commemorations of meaninglessness through the literature we read. I cried every day in class. My first college

paper was on "The Hollow Men." And when I received that paper back it was not the grade I was interested in, I wanted to feel that someone understood me. As ascertained by the remarks on the paper, he not only understood me, but he affirmed me, he praised me, and he reminded me that in spite of all the pathetic and ugly truths of life, we had literature which was as true as any of the rest of it. Of course I fell in love.

Since then I have lived for those passionate, affirming remarks on my papers (see appendix). I learned to refrain (usually) from crying in class but I am fed by the marks teachers make on my papers. These marks are caresses to me. These marks make me feel loved; they make the world make sense to me. I read them over and again. I suppose sex would be the ultimate affirmation. But then again, it would expose the impossibility of being one with the mind or body of another person. I would like to think that that is the bottom line--not lawsuits or power difference or even the pleasure of the text. Desire in the classroom perpetuates an innocent myth, one of mutual synchronistic harmony worthy of seeking in any way possible. I would also like to think that the marks and the tear-stained papers that testify to the dismembered longing, joy, and pain mean something to the teacher as well, something like, "I have come to this lonely place and here is this other" (Anderson 241). And I hope that teachers will be

compassionate and inventive, will maybe point to the text, when a student appears in his or her office, confessing admiration and love, asking "the most difficult and touching question to answer: 'How can I *be* you?'" (Gurko 26).

Personally, I am still trying to answer this question--for myself and for my students. This dissertation has begun the stimulating yet sometimes lonely adventure of trusting myself, becoming myself, and leaving what is so familiar for a far away place. My teachers, my friends, and my sheltered academic world are, like Winesburg, a background on which to paint my dreams. Still, I would have continued hitch-hiking with no destination without the loving and careful influence of my teachers, who are impossible to really leave behind. My name, after all, breaks up into the words "be Linda," an adage that christens me at every crossroads and every new beginning.

NOTES

[1] Though many of the standard texts on Sherwood Anderson are not recent, they are still fine classic overviews of Anderson and his writing. See Appel; Burbank; Campbell and Modlin; Crowly; Fagin; Papinchak; Sutton; Taylor; Townsend; White, *Early Writings*; White, *Exploration*; Williams.

[2] For excellent sources on Modernism and sexuality, see Boone; Butler; Brooks; Glicksberg; Laqueur.

3 Studies dealing with sexual repression in Anderson's work include Ellis; Murphy; White, "Warmth."

[4] See Bidney, Ellis, Hoffman, Howe, Murphy, Rosenfeld, Sutton, White's "Warmth," and White's edition of Anderson's *Memoirs*. In *Memoirs*, Anderson recalls his male friends in Chicago teasing him, saying he was homosexual and that he secretly wanted to be a woman. His friends often psychoanalyzed him, and on one occasion, while walking with a friend, Anderson picked up a twig and "began to break it between my fingers." By breaking the twig, his friend

explained, he was trying to destroy the phallic in himself (341). Anderson also tells the story of a man in a bar calling him "Mable" and Anderson calling the man "Eva" (417) while other people in the bar stared at them. Anderson's fiction explores gender conflict, most directly in "The Man Who Became a Woman"; further, he presents the artist through a childbirthing metaphor in *Winesburg, Ohio* .

[5] Anderson's idealization of women is derived in part from the fact that he was always in love and yet frequently away from his mate for business or for the solitude and loneliness of writing. Anderson especially admired "modern" women who were gentle, proud, and graceful as well as intelligent--women who thought for themselves and spoke their mind. He viewed schoolteachers, in particular, as "ideal" women.

[6] In *Perhaps Women,* Anderson explains his belief that industrialization has ruined masculinity, and that it may be time for women to take over leading the world: "the woman, at her best, is and will remain a being untouched by the machine" (140).

[7] See Atlas and Bunge.

[8] See White, *Memoirs*; Sutton. Also consider the many

other works of fiction by Anderson such as "I Want to Know Why" and *Beyond Desire.*

[9] See Curry for a comparative reading of Anderson and Joyce; Howe for a study of Anderson as "Lawrencian"; McGee for a reading of pedagogy in Joyce; Briden on pedagogy in Mark Twain; Sedgwick for an analysis of the relationship of the English teacher and Paul in "Paul's Case"; Foster for a discussion of sex and pedagogy in *Oleanna* and *The Lesson*; Myers for an overview of pedagogy and literary childhood in the nineteenth century.

[10] See Bicklen; Ellsworth; Jalongo; Kelly; Kronik; Shepherd; Sugg for various discussions of educational change.

[11] Freire's book was originally written in Portuguese in 1968, coming to the attention of America in 1970 when it was issued in an English translation. I have yet to find an exhaustive bibliography on "Critical Pedagogy"; there are hundreds of excellent articles and books. In addition to the works surveyed in this chapter, I would also like to mention the following: Apple; Conway; Davis, "Manifesto"; Finke, "Pedagogy"; Gabriel; Giroux, *Teachers*; hooks, "Toward"; Morton; Rouse; Simon, *Teaching*; Spack; Tompkins; Trend; Wink. Most of these scholars respond to or acknowledge

Freire, who broke ground for this expansive project in the cultural and political study of education.

[12] In primary education, "the gaze" dominates; teachers often look at their students until they become quiet. In secondary (and beyond) education, the exhibition of the teacher's body is discussed from several perspectives by Gallop, "Breasts" and *Impersonation*; Lewis; Litvak, "Discipline"; McLaren, *Schooling*; Parini; Patai; Salecl; Simon, *Face;* Spack; Tompkins.

[13] For related sources on sexual harassment see Dziech, Gallop, "Feminism" and *Feminist*; Hearn; Jones; Levy; MacKinnon; Mitchell; Paludi; Pichaske; Quinn.

[14] There are many studies concerning traditional Greek education and the classical model of the relationship between teachers and students. See Dover; Dowling; Guthrie; Halperin; Ludwig; Tarrant; Teloh.

[15] When *Yale French Studies* published its special issue on teaching, Shoshana Felman's article "Psychoanalysis and Education" spawned a number of reactions and valuable studies. Felman used the article later as the basis for her book, *Jacques Lacan and the Adventure of Insight.* There are many other noteworthy texts including those by Britzman and

Pitt; Brooke; Cummings; Davis, "Pedagogy"; Finke, "Knowledge"; Fox; Jay; Langs; McGee; Ragland; Ragland-Sullivan; Schleifer; Torgensen, "Loving" and "Response"; Turkle. Fox's text concerns Freudianism, while most others work from Lacan's *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, or from Felman's reading of Lacan.

[16] Jane Gallop, in *Thinking Through the Body*, discusses Sade's desire as not to teach but "to teach someone a lesson" (42). She also explores the meaning of the verb "to socratize" as a digital anal exam in what she refers to as "Sadean pedagogy" (51). For other sources on penetrative pedagogy or pederasty see Bersani; Bremmer, "Adolescents"; "Enigmatic"; "Greek"; Cartledge; Dowling; Percy.

[17] Page references are from the 1976 Penguin edition of Anderson's *Winesburg, Ohio* unless otherwise noted.

[18] Small believes Ciancio "overstates the case" (35) in declaring Wing a pederast. See also Elledge; Love; Stouck; Thurston; White, "Socrates" and *Exploration*; Yingling.

[19] "It was the first real story I ever wrote" (White, *Memoirs* 417). See also Phillips; Small; Sutton. As with many writers, there are slight discrepancies in Anderson's recollection of the writing of his "first real story."

[20] See Phillips and Small.

[21] See Ciancio; Elledge; Love; Stouck; Thurston; White, "Socrates" and *Exploration*; Yingling. All make at least passing reference to the connection between Socrates and Wing.

[22] See Irwin's discussion of Tillich and Eros.

[23] Guthrie; Kaplan; Plato; Teloh.

[24] See White, ed., *Memoirs* and Sutton.

[25] In *Love Letters*, ed. Modlin, Anderson relates to Eleanor Copenhaver that a woman must be brave and strong to be loved by a man. The loved woman allows "tender hurt, the sense of all earth and sky and trees" to be gathered into her body (96). In another letter Anderson says "Your saying 'Go and hurt yourself, be hurt, then come to me' makes me happy" (80).

[26] Arcana; Atlas; Browning; Bunge; Colquitt; Rigsbee.

[27] I personally know several students who fantasize about their teachers during masturbation. I have also attended a Women's Studies conference and participated in a session on teachers (male and female) and sexual objectification of students.

[28] Robert L. McDonald suggests that in the recently published story "Fred," Anderson presents the idea that intimacy between two people is salvation--"that connecting purely, vitally, with another human being . . . is the only way to live" (4-5).

[29] Sting with "The Police"; "Don't Stand So Close to Me": "Young teacher the subject of schoolgirl fantasy . . . inside her there's longing, this girl's an open page . . .you know how bad girls get. Sometimes it's not so easy to be the teacher's pet"; "De do do do, De da da da": "When that eloquence escapes me, their logic ties me up and rapes me."; all songs written by Sting, "The Singles" 1986.

[30] For interesting reading on the body as a text, see Benstock; Cranny-Francis; Kellman.

WORKS CITED

Anderson, David D. Ed., *Critical Essays on Sherwood Anderson.* Boston: G.K. Hall, 1981.

Anderson, Sherwood. *Beyond Desire.* New York: Liveright, 1970.

---. *Many Marriages.* Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow P, 1978.

---. *Perhaps Women.* New York: Liveright, 1931.

---. *Winesburg, Ohio.* New York: Penguin, 1976.

Appel, Paul P. Ed. *Homage to Sherwood Anderson.* Mamaroneck, NY: Appel P, 1970.

Apple, Michael W. *Education and Power.* London: Routledge, 1982.

Arcana, Judith. "Tandy: At the Core of Winesburg." *Studies in Short Fiction.* 24.1 (Winter 1987): 66-70.

Atlas, Marilyn Judith. "Sherwood Anderson and the Women of Winesburg." D. Anderson 250-66.

Barreca, Regina and Deborah Denenholz Morse, eds. *The Erotics of Instruction.* Hanover, NH: UP of New England, 1997.

Barreca, Regina. "Contraband Appetites: Wit, Rage, and Romance in the Classroom." Barreca 1-11.

Barthes, Roland. *Image-Music-Text.* Trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977.

Bauer, Dale M. "Indecent Proposals: Teachers in the Movies." *College English* 60 (1998): 301-17.

Benstock, Shari. "Signifying the Body Feminine." *Textualizing the Feminine: On the Limits of Genre.* Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1991. 23-46.

Bersani, Leo. "Pederasty and Pedagogy." *Raritan* 5 (1985): 14-21.

Besner, Hilda F., and Charlotte I. Spungin. *Gay and Lesbian Students: Understanding Their Needs.* Washington, DC: Taylor and Francis, 1995.

Bidney, Martin. "Anderson and the Androgyne: 'Something More than Man or Woman'." *Studies in Short Fiction* 25 (1988): 261-73.

Biklen, Sari Knopp. *School Work: Gender and the Cultural Construction of Teaching.* New York: Teachers College P, 1995.

Boone, Joseph Allen. *Libidinal Currents: Sexuality and the Shaping of Modernism.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998.

Bort, Barry D. "*Wineburg, Ohio:* Escape from Isolation." *Midwest Quarterly* 11 (1970):443-56.

Bremmer, Jan N. "Adolescents, *Symposion*, and Pederasty" Ed. Oswyn Murray. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1990. 135-48.

---. "Greek Pederasty and Modern Homosexuality." Bremmer, ed. *From Sappho to De Sade: Moments in the History of Sexuality.* London: Routledge, 1989. 1-14.

---, "Paederasty." *Arethusa 13 (1980):* 279-98.

Briden, Earl F. "Twainian Pedagogy and the No-Account Lessons of 'Hadleyburg'." *Studies in Short Fiction* (1990): 125-34.

Britzman, Deborah P. and Alice J. Pitt. "Pedagogy and Transference: Casting the Past of Learning Into the Presence of Teaching." *Theory Into Practice* 35 (1996): 117-23.

Brooke, Robert. "Lacan, Transference, and Writing Instruction." *College English* 49 (1987): 679-91.

Brooks, Peter. *Body Work: Objects of Desire in Modern Narrative.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1993.

Browning, Chris. "Kate Swift: Sherwood Anderson's Creative Eros." *Tennessee Studies in Literature* 8 (1968): 141-48.

Bunge, Nancy. "Women in Sherwood Anderson's Fiction." D. Anderson 242-49.

Burbank, Rex. *Sherwood Anderson.* Boston: Twayne, 1964.

Butler, Judith. *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'.* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Campbell, Hilbert H. and Charles E. Modlin, eds. *Sherwood Anderson: Centennial Studies.* Troy, New York: Whitston, 1976.

Cartledge, Paul. "Politics of Spartan Pederasty." *Homosexuality in the Ancient World.* Wayne R. Dynes and Stephen Donaldson, eds. New York: Garland, 1992. 17-36.

Ciancio, Ralph. "The Sweetness of the Twisted Apples: Unity of

Vision in *Winesburg, Ohio* ." *PMLA* 87 (1972): 994-1006.

Colquitt, Clare. "Motherlove in Two Narratives of Community: *Winesburg, Ohio* and *The Country of the Pointed Firs.* Crowley, ed. 73-97.

Conway, Jill K. "Politics, Pedagogy, and Gender." *Daedalus* 116.4 (1987): 137-51.

Cranny-Francis, Anne. *The Body in the Text.* Melbourne: Melbourne UP, 1995.

Crowley, John W., Ed. *New Essays on* Winesburg, Ohio. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990.

Culley, Margo, *et. al.* "The Politics of Nurturance." *Gendered Subjects: The Dynamics of Feminist Teaching.* Margo Culley and Catherine Portuges, eds., Boston: Routledge, 1985. 11-20.

Curry, Sister Martha. "Sherwood Anderson and James Joyce." *American Literature* 52.2 (1980): 236-49.

Davis, Robert Con. "A Manifesto for Oppositional Pedagogy: Freire, Bourdieu, Merod, and Graff." Morton and Zavarzadeh 248-67.

---. "Pedagogy, Lacan, and the Freudian Subject." *College English* 49 (1987): 749-55.

Doll, Mary Aswell. "Teaching as an Erotic Art." *To the Lighthouse and Back: Writings on Teaching and Living.* New York: Peter Lang, 1995. 42-54.

Dover, K.J. *Greek Homosexuality.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1978.

Dowling, Linda. *Hellenism and Homosexuality in Victorian Oxford.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994.

Dziech, Billie Wright, and Linda Weiner. *The Lecherous Professor: Sexual Harassment on Campus.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1990.

Ebert, Teresa L. "For a Red Pedagogy: Feminism, Desire, and Need." *College English* 58 (1996): 795-819.

Elledge, Jim. "Dante's Lovers in Sherwood Anderson's 'Hands.'" *Studies in Short Fiction* 21 (Winter 1984): 11-15.

Ellis, James. "Sherwood Anderson's Fear of Sexuality: Horses, Men, and Homosexuality." *Studies in Short Fiction* 30 (1993): 595-601.

Ellsworth, Elizabeth. *Teaching Positions: Difference, Pedagogy, and the Power of Address.* New York: Teachers College P, 1997.

Fagin, N. Bryllion. *The Phenomenon of Sherwood Anderson: A Study in American Life and Letters.* New York: Russell and Russell, 1973.

Felman, Shoshana. *Jacques Lacan and the Adventure of Insight: Psychoanalysis in Contemporary Culture.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1987.

Finke, Laurie A. "Knowledge as Bait: Feminism, Voice, and the Pedagogical Unconscious." *College English* 55 (1993): 7-27.

---. "The Pedagogy of the Depressed: Feminism, Poststructuralism, and Pedagogical Practice." *Teaching Contemporary Theory to Undergraduates.* Dianne F. Sadoff and William E. Cain, eds. New York: MLA, 1994. 154-68.

Foster, Verna. "Sex, Power, and Pedagogy in Mamet's *Oleanna* and Ionesco's *The Lesson.*" 36-50.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Random House, 1979.

Fox, Seymour. *Freud and Education.* Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1975.

Frank, Arthur W. "Lecturing and Transference: The Undercover Work of Pedagogy." Gallop. *Pedagogy.* 28-35.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Trans. Myra Bergman Ramos. New York: Seabury P, 1970.

Fussell, Edwin. "*Winesburg, Ohio* : Art and Isolation." *Modern Fiction Studies* 6 (1960): 106-14.

Gabriel, Susan L. and Isaiah Smithson, eds. *Gender in the Classroom: Power and Pedagogy.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1990.

Gallop, Jane. "Feminism and Harassment Policy." *Academe* Sep.-Oct. 1994: 16-23.

---. *Feminist Accused of Sexual Harassment.* Durham: Duke UP, 1997.

---, ed. *Pedagogy: The Question of Impersonation.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1995.

---. "The Teacher's Breasts." Gallop, *Pedagogy* 79-89.

---. *Thinking Through the Body.* New York: Columbia UP, 1988.

Giroux, Henry A. *Teachers as Intellectuals: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of Learning.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey, 1988.

Giroux, Henry A. and Peter L. McLaren, eds. *Critical Pedagogy, The State, and Cultural Struggle.* New York: State U of New York P, 1989.

---. "Radical Pedagogy as Cultural Politics: Beyond the Discourse of Critique and Anti-Utopianism." Morton and Zavarzadeh 153-86.

Glavin, John. "The Intimacies of Instruction." Barreca. 12-27.

Glicksberg, Charles I. *The Sexual Revolution in Modern American Literature.* New York: Hague, 1971.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Volatile Bodies: Toward a Corporeal Feminism.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1994.

Grumet, Madeleine R. *Bitter Milk: Women and Teaching.* Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1988.

Gurko, Jane. "Sexual Energy in the Classroom." *Lesbian Studies: Present and Future.* Ed. Margaret Cruikshank. Old Westbury, New York: Feminist P, 1982. 25-31.

Guthrie, W.K.C. *Socrates.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971.

Halperin, David M. *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and Other Essays on Greek Love.* New York: Routledge, 1990.

Hearn, Jeff, and Wendy Parkin. *'Sex' at 'Work': The Power and Paradox of Organization Sexuality.* New York: St. Martin's P, 1987.

Hoffman, Frederick J. *Freudianism and the Literary Mind.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1945.

hooks, bell. "Passionate Pedagogy: Erotic Student/Faculty Relationships." *Z Magazine* Mar. 1996: 45-51.

---. "Toward a Revolutionary Feminist Pedagogy." *Falling Into Theory: Conflicting Views on Reading Literature.* Ed. David H. Richter. Boston: St. Martin's P, 1994. 74-79.

Howe, Irving. *Sherwood Anderson.* Canada and USA: William Sloane Associates, Inc., 1951.

Howe, Irving. "In the Lawrencian Orbit." 179-96.

Irwin, Alexander C. *Eros Toward the World: Paul Tillich and the Theology of the Erotic.* Minneapolis: Fortress P, 1991.

Jalongo, Mary Renck, *et.al. Teachers' Stories: From Personal Narrative to Professional Insight.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass P, 1995.

Jay, Gregory S. "The Subject of Pedagogy: Lessons in Psychoanalysis and Politics." *College English* 49 (1987):

785-99.

---. "Taking Multiculturalism Personally: Ethnos and Ethos in the Classroom." Gallop, *Pedagogy* 117-28.

Jones, Alison. "Desire, Sexual Harassment, and Pedagogy in the University Classroom." *Theory Into Practice* 35 (1996): 102-109.

Kanpol, Barry. *Critical Pedagogy: An Introduction.* Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey, 1994.

Kaplan, Justin D., trans. *Dialogues of Plato.* By Plato. New York: Pocket Books, 1950.

Karamcheti, Indira. "Caliban in the Classroom." Gallop, *Pedagogy* 138-46.

Kellman, Steven G. *Loving Reading: Erotics of the Text.* Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1985.

Kelly, Elizabeth A. *Education, Democracy, and Public Knowledge.* Boulder, CO: Westview P, 1995.

Kronik, John W. "On Men Mentoring Women: Then and Now." *Profession*. New York: MLA, 1990. 52-57.

Lacan, Jacques. *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis.* Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Norton, 1973.

Langs, Robert. "Boundaries and Frames: Non-Transference in Teaching." *AWP Chronicle* 22.1 (1989): 1,4-8.

Laqueur, Thomas. *Making Sex: Body and Gender From the Greeks to Freud.* Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1990.

Levy, Anne, and Michele Paludi. *Workplace Sexual Harassment.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997.

Lewis, Magda Gere. *Without a Word: Teaching Beyond Women's Silence.* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Litvak, Joseph. "Discipline, Spectacle, and Melancholia in and around the Gay Studies Classroom." Gallop, *Pedagogy* 19-27.

---. "Pedagogy and Sexuality." *Professions of Desire: Lesbian and Gay Studies in Literature.* George E. Haggerty and Bonnie Zimmerman, eds. New York: MLA, 1995. 19-30.

Love, Glen A. "*Winesburg, Ohio* and the Rhetoric of Silence." *American Literature* 15 (1968): 38-57.

Ludwig, Paul W. "Politics and Eros in Aristophanes' Speech: *Symposium* 191E-192A and the Comedies." *American Journal of Philology* 117 (1996): 537-62.

MacCannell, Juliet Flower. "Resistance to Sexual Theory." Morton and Zavarzadeh, 64-89.

MacKinnon, Catharine A. *Sexual Harassment of Working Women: A Case of Sex Discrimination.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.

Man, Paul de. "The Resistance to Theory." *Yale French Studies* 63 (1982): 3-20.

Maresca, Carol J. "Gestures as Meaning in Sherwood Anderson's

Winesburg, Ohio ." *College Language Association Journal* 9 (March 1966): 279-83.

McDonald, Robert L. "A Man's Worth: Intimacy in Sherwood Anderson's 'Fred'." *Notes on Contemporary Literature* 28.3 (1998): 3-5.

McGee, Patrick. "Joyce's Pedagogy: *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* as Theory." *Coping With Joyce: Essays from the Copenhagen Symposium.* Morris Beja and Shari Benstock, eds. Columbus: Ohio State UP, 1989. 206-19.

---. "Truth and Resistance: Teaching as a Form of Analysis." *College English* 49 (1987): 667-77.

McLaren, Peter. *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture: Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Era.* London: Routledge, 1995.

---. *Schooling as a Ritual Performance: Towards a Political Economy of Educational Symbols and Gestures.* New York: Routledge, 1993.

Miller, William V. "Earth-Mothers, Succubi, and Other Ectoplasmic Spirits: The Women in Sherwood Anderson's Short Stories." D. Anderson 196-209.

Mitchell, Felicia: "The Thin Line: Sexism, Sexual Harassment, and the Student Complaint." *Feminist Teacher* 9.3 (1995): 125-128.

Modlin, Charles E., ed. *Sherwood Anderson's Love Letters to Eleanor Copenhaver Anderson.* Athens: U of Georgia P, 1989.

Morton, Donald and Mas'ud Zavarzadeh, eds. *Theory/Pedagogy/Politics: Texts for Change.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1991.

Murphy, George D. "The Theme of Sublimation in Anderson's *Winesburg, Ohio* ." *Modern Fiction Studies* 13.2 (1967): 237-46.

Myers, Mitzi. "The Erotics of Pedagogy: Historical Intervention, Literary Representation, the 'Gift of Education,' and the Agency of Children." *Children's Literature* 23 (1995): 1-30.

Paludi, Michele A., ed. *Ivory Power: Sexual Harassment on Campus.* New York: State U of New York P, 1990.

Papinchak, Robert Allen. *Sherwood Anderson: A Study of the Short Fiction.* New York: Twayne Publishers, 1992.

Parini, Jay. "Cultivating a Teaching Persona." *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Sept. 1997: A92.

Patai, Daphne. "Minority Status and the Stigma of 'Surplus Visibility'." *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Oct. 1991: A52.

Percy, William Armstrong III. *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1995.

Phillips, William L. "How Sherwood Anderson Wrote *Winesburg, Ohio.*" *The Achievement of Sherwood Anderson: Essays in*

Criticism. White, 62-84.

Pichaske, David R. "When Students Make Sexual Advances." *Chronicle of Higher Education.* Feb. 1995: B1.

Pickering, Samuel. "*Winesburg, Ohio* : A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man." *Southern Quarterly* 16.1 (October 1977): 27-38.

Plato. *Dialogues of Plato.* Trans. Benjamin Jowett. Ed. Justin D. Kaplan. New York: Pocket Books, 1950.

Quinn, Roseanne Lucia. "'I should learn to see the truth as great men have seen it': Male Mentoring, Seduction, and Sexual Harassment in Higher Education." *Feminist Teacher* 7.2 (1993): 20-25.

Ragland, Ellie. "Psychoanalysis and Pedagogy: What are Mastery and Love Doing in the Classroom?" *Pre/Text* 15 (1994): 47-78.

Ragland-Sullivan, Ellie. "Plato's *Symposium* and the Lacanian Theory of Transference: Or, What is Love?" *South Atlantic Quarterly* 88 (Fall 1989): 725-55.

Rigsbee, Sally Adair. "The Feminine in *Winesburg, Ohio* ." *Studies in American Fiction* 9 (1981): 233-44.

Rosenfeld, Paul. Ed. *The Sherwood Anderson Reader.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1947.

Rouse, John. "An Erotics of Teaching." *College English* 45 (1983): 535-48.

Salecl, Renata and Slavoj Zizek, eds. *Gaze And Voice as Love Objects.* Durham: Duke UP, 1996.

Scheman, Naomi. "On Waking Up One Morning and Discovering We Are Them." Gallop, *Pedagogy.* 106-16.

Schleifer, Ronald. "Lacan's Enunciation and the Cure of Mortality: Teaching, Transference, and Desire." *College English* 49 (1987): 801-15.

Schmidt, Patricia A. *Beginning in Retrospect: Writing and Reading a Teacher's Life.* New York: Teachers College P, 1997.

Sedgwick, Eve Kosofsky. "Across Gender, Across Sexuality: Willa Cather and Others." *South Atlantic Quarterly* 88.1 (Winter 1989): 53-71.

Shepherd, Linda Jean. *Lifting the Veil: The Feminine Face of Science.* Boston: Shambhala, 1993.

Simon, Roger I. "Face to Face With Alterity: Postmodern Jewish Identity and the Eros of Pedagogy." Gallop, *Pedagogy.* 90-105.

---. *Teaching Against the Grain: Texts for a Pedagogy of Possibility.* New York: Bergin and Garvey, 1992.

Small, Judy Jo. *A Reader's Guide to the Short Stories of Sherwood Anderson.* New York: G.K. Hall and Co., 1994.

Spack, Ruth. "The (In)Visibility of the Person(Al) in Academe." *College English* 59 (1997): 9-31.

Sting. "The Singles" with "The Police." USA and Canada: Virgin Music, Magnetic P, APM Records, Inc. 1986. cuts 5,6,10.

Stouck, David. "*Winesburg, Ohio* as a Dance of Death." *Critical Essays on Sherwood Anderson.* Ed. David D. Anderson. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1981. 181-95.

Sugg, Redding S. Jr. *Motherteacher: The Feminization of American Education.* Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1978.

Sutton, William A. *The Road to Winesburg: A Mosaic of the Imaginative Life of Sherwood Anderson.* Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow P, 1972.

Tarrant, Dorothy. "The Touch of Socrates." *Classical Quarterly* 8 (1958): 95-98.

Taylor, Welford Dunaway. *Sherwood Anderson.* New York: Frederick Ungar, 1977.

Teloh, Henry. *Socratic Education in Plato's Early Dialogues.* South Bend, IN: U of Notre Dame P, 1986.

Thurston, Jarvis. "Anderson and 'Winesburg': Mysticism and Craft." *Accent: A Quarterly of New Literature* 16 (1956): 107-29.

Tompkins, Jane. "Pedagogy of the Distressed." *College English* 52 (1990): 653-60.

Torgersen, Eric. "Loving (Hating) the Messenger: Transference and Teaching." *AWP Newsletter* (November 1988): 1,12,14,15.

---. "Response to Ann Turkle." *AWP Chronicle* 22.1 (September

1989): 9,10.

Townsend, Kim. *Sherwood Anderson.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Trend, David. *Cultural Pedagogy: Art/Education/Politics.* New York: Bergin and Garvey, 1992.

Trilling, Lionel. "Sherwood Anderson." *The Liberal Imagination.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979. 21-32.

Turkle, Ann. "Teaching and Transference: Belaboring the Metaphor." *AWP Chronicle* 22.1 (September 1989): 9-10.

Ungar, Steven. "The Professor of Desire." *Yale French Studies* 63 (1982): 81-97.

Ward, J.A. "*Winesburg, Ohio* : Habitual Silence and the Roaring of Voices." *American Silences: The Realism of James Agee, Walker Evans, and Edward Hopper.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State UP, 1985. 35-77.

Wexelblatt, Robert. *Professors at Play.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 1991.

White, Ray Lewis, ed. *The Achievement of Sherwood Anderson: Essays in Criticism.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1966.

---, ed. *Sherwood Anderson's Memoirs: A Critical Edition.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1969.

---, ed. *Sherwood Anderson: A Story Teller's Story.* Cleveland: P of Case Western Reserve U, 1968.

---, ed. *Sherwood Anderson: Early Writings.* Kent, Ohio: Kent State UP, 1989.

---. "Socrates in Winesburg." *Notes on Modern American Literature* 10 (1986): 3-6.

---. "The Warmth of Desire: Sex in Anderson's Novels." *Sherwood Anderson: Dimensions of His Literary Art.* Ed. David D. Anderson. Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1976. 24-40.

---. *Winesburg, Ohio: An Exploration.* Boston: Twayne, 1990.

Williams, Kenny J. *A Storyteller and a City: Sherwood Anderson's Chicago.* DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois UP, 1988.

Wink, Joan. *Critical Pedagogy: Notes From the Real World.* New York: Longman, 1997.

Yingling, Thomas. "*Winesburg, Ohio* and the End of Collective Experience." Crowley, *New Essays*: 98-126.

APPENDIX

"I hope these remarks are helpful. I enjoyed reading it and I learned things."

"Superb! and that's an adjective I seldom use."

"This is quite convincing, at times even fascinating..."

"Nice touch."

"Isn't there evidence that ancient Egyptians knew about sperm?

"Wonderfully and (for a kid) wisely done."

"Real strides toward becoming a sophisticated reader of texts. There are a few important statements that need clarification (see my marginalia)."

"Good stuff! With just a tiny bit of 'perfecting' this recipe

could be ready to send off someplace. Why not give it a shot?"

"I think you need to prepare your reader for this."

"I never quite saw the reason for all your attention to Hemingway's war wound. What was your purpose?"

"Excellent opening!"

"This is exceptional, sophisticated work. Very well done (Yes, I can pun, too)."

"The quotations you've chosen are excellent, and generally, your prose is smooth and pointed. I'm very pleased."

"This is your thesis, is it not? A reason to postpone it to page 4?"

"You have a powerful thesis here that I think will be certainly publishable, if you are willing to cast the paper into standard format."

"This is a fascinating paper--full of provocative ideas and observations, which is what I hoped would result from these short papers."

"Belinda- you could, of course, take this further...but, as is, it is compelling, well-researched, and, toward the end, even quite moving. I liked this a lot."

"One of the most compelling aspects of your papers is the quotations you manage to find. I'm continually amazed by these."

"Would it be too reductive to ask for a thesis?"

"A suitable final product reflecting a semester of maturing thought over the subject (This accomplishes my aim in assigning a 'term' paper.) I am still convinced this work has publication possibilities."

"Is this what you want to say?"

VITA

Belinda Diane Bruner

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: PEDAGOGY AND THE BODY IN SHERWOOD ANDERSON'S *WINESBURG, OHIO*

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Education: Graduated from Broken Bow High School, Broken Bow, Oklahoma, in May 1981; attended the University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma at Chickasha; received Associate of Arts degree in Music from Eastern Oklahoma State College at Wilburton in May, 1985; received Bachelor of Arts degree in English from Oklahoma State University in May, 1987; received Master of Arts degree in English from Oklahoma State University in May, 1991. Completed the Requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1998.

Experience: Teaching Assistant, 1987 to 1990, Teaching Associate, 1991 to 1996, Lecturer, 1996 to present, Department of English, Oklahoma State University.

Professional Memberships: Minority Faculty and Staff Association, South Central Modern Language Association, Modern Language Association, National Council of Teachers of English.